Stochastic Proximal Gradient Consensus Over Random Networks

Mingyi Hong and Tsung-Hui Chang

arXiv:1511.08905v1 [math.OC] 28 Nov 2015

Abstract

We consider solving a convex, possibly stochastic optimization problem over a randomly time-varying multi-agent network. Each agent has access to some local objective function, and it only has unbiased estimates of the gradients of the smooth component. We develop a dynamic stochastic proximal-gradient consensus (DySPGC) algorithm, with the following key features: *i)* it works for both the static and certain randomly time-varying networks; *ii)* it allows the agents to utilize either the exact or stochastic gradient information; *iii)* it is convergent with provable rate. In particular, we show that the proposed algorithm converges to a global optimal solution, with a rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/r)$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{r})$) when the exact (resp. stochastic) gradient is available, where r is the iteration counter.

Interestingly, the developed algorithm bridges a number of (seemingly unrelated) distributed optimization algorithms, such as the EXTRA (Shi *et al.* 2014), the PG-EXTRA (Shi *et al.* 2015), the IC/IDC-ADMM (Chang *et al.* 2014), and the DLM (Ling *et al.* 2015) and the classical distributed subgradient method. Identifying such relationship allows for significant generalization of these methods. We also discuss one such generalization which accelerates the DySPGC (hence accelerating EXTRA, PG-EXTRA, IC-ADMM).

I. Introduction

A. The Global Consensus Problem

Consider the following classical problem

$$\min_{y\in\mathbb{R}^M} \; f(y) := \sum_{i=1}^{N} f_i(y), \tag{1}$$

where $f_i(y) : \mathbb{R}^M \to \mathbb{R}$ is a convex and possibly nonsmooth function, for $i = 1, \cdots, N$. Consider a collection of N agents connected by a network defined by an *undirected* graph $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}\}$, with $|\mathcal{V}| = N$ vertices and $|\mathcal{E}| = E$ edges. Each agent can communicate with its immediate neighbors, and it can only optimize its local component function f_i. This problem has found applications in various domains such as distributed consensus [1], [2], distributed and parallel machine learning [3], [5], [33] and distributed

signal processing [6], [7]; see [8] for a recent survey. The key research question is: how to distributedly compute an optimal solution of (1), using the agents' local (possibly inexact and stochastic) gradient information about the objective.

Let each agent i keep a local copy of y, say y_i. The well-known distributed subgradient (DSG) method [9] is given by

$$y_i^{r+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_{ij}^r y_j^r - \gamma^r d_i^r, \ \forall \ i \in \mathcal{V}, \tag{2}$$

where r denotes the iteration counter; $d_i^r \in \partial f_i(y_i^r)$ denotes a subgradient of the local function f_i evaluated at y_i^r; $w_{ij}^r \geq 0$ denotes the weight for the link e_{ij} at iteration r; and $\gamma^r > 0$ denotes some stepsize parameter. Let $\bar{y}_i^r = \frac{1}{r}\sum_{t=1}^{r} y_i^t$.

The convergence of the DSG iteration (2) was first analyzed in [9] by Nedić and Ozdaglar. It was shown that if the subgradient vector is bounded, and that the weights $\{w_{ij}\}$ and the graph $\mathcal{G}$ satisfy certain regularity assumptions, then each $\bar{y}_i^r$ converges to a neighborhood of the optimal solution (resp. the exact optimal solution) if γ^r is a constant (resp. a diminishing sequence). As a special case, when $f(x) \equiv 0$ (only the consensus among the agents is sought for), then the convergence of the iteration (2) was first studied by Tsitsiklis [1]. The DSG iteration has been extended to scenarios where there is a local constraint for each agent [10], or the messages exchanged among the agents are quantized [11], or the communication among the agents is noisy [12]. Also see [13]–[18] for other related methods for solving (1) under various different assumptions.

The rate of convergence analysis of the DSG-type method has been a central research issue. In its most general form, it is known that when appropriate diminishing stepsizes are chosen, DSG converges with a rate of $\mathcal{O}(\ln(r)/\sqrt{r})$ [15], for both static and time-varying networks. Duchi *et al.* propose a distributed dual-averaging algorithm and show that it converges with a rate of $\mathcal{O}(\ln(r)/\sqrt{r})$. Jakovetic *et al.* [16] show that when the objective has Lipschitz continuous and bounded gradient, and when the graph is static, it is possible to accelerate the DSG to achieve an $\mathcal{O}(1/r^2)$ rate, but at the expense of solving more complicated subproblems, each of which involves multiple rounds of communication and computation. If only simple computation/communication steps are performed, the rate becomes $\mathcal{O}(\ln(r)/r)$. A related acceleration scheme has also been proposed in [15], which further works for time-varying B-connected graphs. Under the smoothness assumption on f, Shi *et al.* [13] propose an interesting algorithm called EXTRA, which adds certain *error-correction* terms to the DSG (2). By adding such correction, EXTRA uses constant stepsize and achieves an $\mathcal{O}(1/r)$ rate for smooth convex problem and linear convergence

for certain smooth strongly convex problems. This method has also been generalized to solve nonsmooth problems [14], but both algorithms in [13], [14] can only work for static networks.

Another popular approach for distributed optimization is to use the alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM) [19]–[21]. Applying the ADMM to distributed optimization has been first suggested in [19], and subsequently popularized in [6], [20]. The $\mathcal{O}(1/r)$ sublinear rate of convergence for decentralized consensus ADMM (C-ADMM) has been shown by Wei and Ozdaglar [22], where it is assumed that the underlying graph is generated according to certain stochastic mechanism. When the problem is smooth, the linear convergence of C-ADMM is shown in [23]. However the C-ADMM usually requires solving local optimization problems exactly (cf. [6], [7], [20], [24], [25]), which can be expensive in certain applications. This requirement has been relaxed by two recent works [26] and [27]. In particular, Chang *et al.* [26] develop an inexact C-ADMM (IC-ADMM) algorithm, which under additional assumptions of $g_i(\cdot)$, uses a simple (proximal) gradient step at each ADMM iteration. Ling *et al.* [27] also propose to replace the exact minimization by certain proximal gradient steps. Recently, Hong *et al.* [28] show that the ADMM-based method (with exact or inexact update) can be used to solve certain *nonconvex* global consensus problem, with a convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{r})$.

We briefly compare the two types of algorithms.

• (Problem types). The DSG can solve convex problems with only subgradient information about the objective, while to our best knowledge the ADMM does not work for this case.

• (Gradient Information). The DSG only needs (possibly stochastic) subgradients of the objective [29], while the ADMM either solves subproblems exactly [6], [20], or requires gradient information of the smooth part [27], [30].

• (Convergence rates). When the objective function f has certain additional structures (e.g., smooth or a smooth plus a simple nonsmooth function), the distributed ADMM generally converges faster (with a rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/r)$) than its DSG counterpart (with a rate of $\mathcal{O}(\ln(r)/\sqrt{r})$). However, in this setting it is also possible to modify the iteration of the latter algorithm to match the rate $\mathcal{O}(1/r)$ (cf. the EXTRA algorithm [13]), or to accelerate it to achieve similar rate (cf. [15], [16]).

• (Network structures). The DSG generally works when the underlying network is time-varying and follows the so-called B-connected structure [31]. However the ADMM-based method only works for static network, except for the recent variants proposed in [22], [30], both of which work for certain randomized networks.

B. Contribution of This Work

In this work, we consider the following structured version of the global consensus problem (1)

$$\min_{y\in\mathbb{R}^M} \; f(y) := \sum_{i=1}^{N} f_i(y) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(g_i(y) + h_i(y)\right), \tag{3}$$

where each $g_i : \mathbb{R}^M \to \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth convex function; each $h_i : \mathbb{R}^M \to \mathbb{R}$ is a convex possibly lower semi-continuous function. We propose an ADMM based method, named dynamic stochastic proximal-gradient consensus (DySPGC), that has the following key features:

- When only an unbiased estimate of each ∇g_i is known, the algorithm converges with a rate $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{r})$;
- When the exact ∇g_i is known, the rate becomes $\mathcal{O}(1/r)$;
- The algorithm works for both the static and certain random time-varying networks.

What is more interesting is our insight on the connection between the C-ADMM-type methods and a few DSG-type methods. In particular, we show that the EXTRA/PG-EXTRA [13], [14], despite being posed as error-corrected DSGs, can be viewed as special cases of the proposed DySPGC (for static network with symmetric weights and exact gradients). This observation explains the relative fast convergence performance of these two algorithms compared with the DSG (for structured problems (3)). Further, we also establish a close connection between the DSG (2) and the proposed DySPGC. Additionally our method generalizes other distributed ADMM-type methods such as the DLM [27] and the IC-ADMM [26].

The connection we established in this work offers a unifying perspective for a family of distributed methods. It also allows significant generalization of these methods based on existing theories such as the primal-dual methods. As an example, we develop an accelerated DySPGC (inspired by a recent work [32]), which is capable of reducing the convergence rate in terms of its dependency on the Lipschitz constant of the ∇g_i's.

II. System Model

A. Problem Setup

We consider optimizing problem (3), and make the following blanket assumptions.

Assumption 1.

1) The optimal solution set of (3), denoted as $X^* \subseteq \mathbb{R}^M$ is nonempty; The Slater condition holds;

2) Let $g(y)=\sum_{i=1}^N g_i(y)$, and $h(y)=\sum_{i=1}^N h_i(y)$. The h_i's *prox operators*

$$\text{prox}_{h_i}^{\beta}(u) := \min_y h_i(y) + \frac{\beta}{2}\|y-u\|^2, \tag{4}$$

are easy to compute;

3) Each ∇g_i is Lipschitz continuous (with constant $P_i > 0$)

$$\|\nabla g_i(y) - \nabla g_i(v)\| \leq P_i\|y-v\|, \ \forall \ y, v \in \text{dom}(h). \tag{5}$$

As have been mentioned in the introduction, we consider a collection of N agents defined over a connected *undirected* graph $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}\}$, with $|\mathcal{V}| = N$ vertices and $|\mathcal{E}| = E$ edges. Define a companion *symmetric* directed graph given by $\mathcal{G}_d = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{A}, W\}$, where $\mathcal{A}$ is a set of directed arcs with $|\mathcal{A}| = 2E$, and for every edge in $\mathcal{E}$ which connects nodes i, j, we have $e_{ij}, e_{ji} \in \mathcal{A}$; $W \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N\times N}$ is a *weight matrix*. Let us use $\mathcal{N}_i$ to denote the neighborhood of node i, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{N}_i := \{j \mid e_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}\}. \tag{6}$$

Generally we will assume that the weight matrix W satisfies the following two conditions:

1) W is a row stochastic matrix, i.e., $\{W[i,j] \geq 0\}$, $\sum_j W[i,j] = 1, \ \forall \ i$;
2) The diagonal elements of W are all positive, and its off-diagonal elements all satisfy

$$W[i,j] > 0, \text{ if } e_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}, \quad W[i,j] = 0, \text{ otherwise.} \tag{7}$$

Later we will provide explicit expressions for W.

Consider an equivalent reformulation of problem (3) (equivalent when $\mathcal{G}$ is connected)

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\{x_i\},\{z_{ij}\}} \quad & f(x) := \sum_{i=1}^N \left(g_i(x_i) + h_i(x_i)\right), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x_i = z_{ij}, \quad x_j = z_{ij}, \ \forall \ (i,j) \in \mathcal{A}, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where we have introduced N auxiliary variables $\{x_i \in \mathbb{R}^M\}$, and $2E$ auxiliary variables $\{z_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^M\}$. Define $x := \{x_i\} \in \mathbb{R}^{NM\times 1}$, and $z := \{z_{ij}\} \in \mathbb{R}^{2EM}$.

To compactly represent the constraint set of problem (8), let us define the following two matrices

$$A := \begin{bmatrix} A_1 \\ A_2 \end{bmatrix}, \ B := \begin{bmatrix} -I_{2EM} \\ -I_{2EM} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{9}$$

where each $A_1, A_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{2EM\times NM}$ is composed of $2E \times N$ blocks of $M \times M$ matrices. If $e_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}$ and

z_{ij} is the qth block of z, then (q,i)th block of A_1 and (q,j)th block of A_2 are both I_M, an $M \times M$ identity matrix; otherwise, the corresponding block is an $M \times M$ zero matrix 0_M. Note that the matrix B stacks two identity matrices because each link variable z_{ij} only appears once in the constraint.

Using the above matrix notation, problem (8) is equivalent to the following problem [6], [8], [26], [27]

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x,z} \quad & f(x) := \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(g_i(x_i) + h_i(x_i)\right) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & Ax + Bz = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{P}$$

Define the gradient of the smooth part of the objective as $G(x) := [\nabla g_1(x_1); \cdots ; \nabla g_N(x_N)]$.

B. Randomly Time-Varying Graph Structure

In this work, we assume that the edges and/or the nodes of the graph $\mathcal{G}$ are activated according to certain time-varying dynamic patterns. To describe such dynamic pattern, at a given time r, define a new graph $\mathcal{G}^r = \{\mathcal{V}^r, \mathcal{E}^r\}$, and its companion graph $\mathcal{G}_d^r = \{\mathcal{V}^r, \mathcal{A}^r, W^r\}$ where $\mathcal{V}^r \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, $\mathcal{E}^r \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{A}^r \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, and each weight matrix W^r is a stochastic matrix satisfying (7). Again $\mathcal{G}_d^r$ is symmetric, meaning if e connects nodes i and j with $e \in \mathcal{E}^r$, then $e_{ij}, e_{ji} \in \mathcal{A}^r$. The precise specification of the random graphs $\{\mathcal{G}^r\}$ is given below [12], [17], [22], [30].

Definition 2.1: (Randomly Activated Graph) At each time r, each link pair $(i,j),(j,i) \in \mathcal{A}$ has a probability $p_{ij} = p_{ji} \in (0,1]$ of being active. The set of active nodes $\mathcal{V}^r$ is given by:

$$\mathcal{V}^r = \{i \mid \exists e_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}^r, \ \forall \ j \in \mathcal{V}\}.$$

Effectively at each time r a node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ has a probability $\alpha_i > 0$ of being active, while such α_i is a function of $\{p_{ij} \mid j \in \mathcal{N}_i\}$. Define

$$\Psi = \text{diag}\{\alpha_i\} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}, \quad \Phi = \text{diag}\{p_{ij}\} \in \mathbb{R}^{2E \times 2E}. \tag{10}$$

Further, assume that $\mathcal{G}$ is connected, and realizations of the graphs $\mathcal{G}^r$ and $\mathcal{G}^t$ are independent for all $r \neq t$. ■

In practice, the randomly activated network pattern can be used to model communication and/or node failures [12], [17], [22], [30]. It is the stochastic variant of the so-called B-strongly connected network which has been widely considered in the literature, under very different context [1], [7], [18], [31]. The connection between such randomly generated graph and popular communication protocols such as the gossip protocol and asynchronous protocols has been explored in [12], [17], [22]. Note the graph $\mathcal{G}$

is required to be connected, but $\mathcal{G}^r$'s are not necessarily so. At a given iteration r, we can define the neighborhood $\mathcal{N}_i^r$ for each node i similarly as in (6), and define the matrices A^r and B^r similarly as in (9), making all quantities conforming to the instantaneous graph structure.

Define a vector of positive constants $\rho := \{\rho_{ij} > 0 \mid e_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}\}$, i.e., each ρ_{ij} corresponds to a link variable z_{ij}. According to the above time-varying structure, for a given graph $\mathcal{G}_d^r$ at each iteration r, we can construct a time-dependent diagonal matrix $\Gamma^r \succeq 0$ by

$$\Gamma^r = \left[\begin{array}{ll} \Xi^r \otimes I_M & 0 \\ 0 & \Xi^r \otimes I_M \end{array} \right] \in \mathbb{R}^{4EM \times 4EM}, \tag{11}$$

where $\Xi^r \in \mathbb{R}^{2E \times 2E}$ is a diagonal matrix induced by the graph $\mathcal{G}_d^r$: $\Xi^r[q,q] = \rho_{ij}$ if link if $(i,j) \in \mathcal{A}^r$ and z_{ij} is the qth block of z; otherwise $\Xi^r[q,q] = 0$. Also define matrices $\Gamma \succ 0$ and $\Xi \succ 0$ similarly, but over the original graph $\mathcal{G}_d$.

C. The Gradient Information

Assume that only an estimate of $\nabla g_i(x_i)$, denoted by $\widetilde{g}_i(x_i, \xi_i)$, is available for each agent i, which satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{g}_i(x_i,\xi_i)] = \nabla g_i(x_i),\ \mathbb{E}\left[\|\widetilde{g}_i(x_i,\xi_i) - \nabla g_i(x_i)\|^2\right] \leq \sigma^2, \tag{12}$$

where ξ_i is a random variable following an unknown distribution; σ^2 is the variance of the error.

III. The Proposed Algorithms

Our proposed algorithm is based on the ADMM. Let us first write the augmented Lagrangian of (P):

$$L_\Gamma(x,z,\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^N f_i(x_i) + \langle \lambda, Ax + Bz\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\|Ax+Bz\|_\Gamma^2, \tag{13}$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{4EM}$ is the dual variable. Our definition of the augmented Lagrangian is slightly different from the standard definition due to the use of a positive semidefinite penalty matrix $\Gamma \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{4EM\times 4EM}$. Such modification turns out to be crucial in modeling some graph specific properties.

To proceed, we need the following definitions. For each $i \in \mathcal{V}$ and some $\omega_i \geq 0$, define $\Omega_i := \omega_i I_M$, $\Omega := \text{blkdiag}\{\Omega_1, \cdots, \Omega_N\}$ and $\Omega^r := \text{blkdiag}\{\Omega_1^r, \cdots, \Omega_N^r\}$, i.e., the ith diagonal block of Ω^r equals to zero if $i \notin \mathcal{V}^r$. Let

$$M_+ := A_1^T + A_2^T, \quad M_- := A_1^T - A_2^T. \tag{14}$$

Define $\widehat{\rho}_{i,j} = \frac{\rho_{ij}+\rho_{ji}}{2}$. By this definition, one can verify the following identities

$$M_+(\Xi\otimes I_M)z=\begin{bmatrix}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_1}(\rho_{j1}z_{j1}+\rho_{1j}z_{1j})\\ \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_2}(\rho_{j2}z_{j2}+\rho_{2j}z_{2j})\\ \vdots\\ \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_N}(\rho_{jN}z_{jN}+\rho_{Nj}z_{Nj})\end{bmatrix}, \tag{15a}$$

$$M_+(\Xi\otimes I_M)M_+^Tx=\begin{bmatrix}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_1}2\widehat{\rho}_{j1}x_1+\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_1}2\widehat{\rho}_{j1}x_j\\ \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_2}2\widehat{\rho}_{j2}x_2+\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_2}2\widehat{\rho}_{j2}x_j\\ \vdots\\ \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_N}2\widehat{\rho}_{jN}x_N+\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_N}\widehat{\rho}_{jN}x_j\end{bmatrix}, \tag{15b}$$

$$M_-(\Xi\otimes I_M)M_-^Tx=\begin{bmatrix}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_1}2\widehat{\rho}_{j1}x_1-\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_1}2\widehat{\rho}_{j1}x_j\\ \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_2}2\widehat{\rho}_{j2}x_2-\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_2}2\widehat{\rho}_{j2}x_j\\ \vdots\\ \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_N}2\widehat{\rho}_{jN}x_N-\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_N}2\widehat{\rho}_{jN}x_j\end{bmatrix}. \tag{15c}$$

A. Algorithms

In this section we propose consensus algorithms over the randomly activated graphs. To model the time-varying node activation pattern, let us define $\widetilde{G}^{r+1}(x^r,\xi^{r+1})\in\mathbb{R}^{MN}$ as a vector consists the gradients of the active component functions at time $r+1$

$$\widetilde{G}^{r+1}(x^r,\xi^{r+1}):=[a_1;\ a_2;\ \cdots\ ;a_N]$$
$$\text{with}\quad a_i=\begin{cases}\widetilde{g}_i(x_i^r,\xi^{r+1}) & \text{if } i\in\mathcal{V}^{r+1}\\ 0 & \text{otherwise}\end{cases}.$$

Define $h^{r+1}(x):=\sum_{i\in\mathcal{V}^{r+1}}h_i(x_i)$. Let $\{\eta^r\geq 0\}$ denote a sequence of iteration-dependent parameters, whose values will be given shortly.

Using these definitions, we present in the table below our algorithm in its most general form, named the dynamic stochastic proximal-gradient consensus (DySPGC) algorithm.

Algorithm 1. DySPGC Over Random Graphs

At iteration 0, let $B^T\lambda^0 = 0$, $z^0 = \frac{1}{2}M_+^T x^0$.

At each iteration $r+1$, update the variable blocks by:

$$x^{r+1} = \arg\min_x \ \left\langle \widetilde{G}^{r+1}(x^r, \xi^{r+1}), x - x^r \right\rangle + h^{r+1}(x) \tag{16a}$$
$$+ \frac{1}{2}\left\|A^{r+1}x + B^{r+1}z^r + \Gamma^{-1}\lambda^r\right\|_\Gamma^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|x - x^r\|^2_{\Omega^{r+1}+\eta^{r+1}I_{MN}}$$

$$x_i^{r+1} = x_i^r, \quad \text{if } i \notin \mathcal{V}^{r+1} \tag{16b}$$

$$z^{r+1} = \arg\min_z \ \frac{1}{2}\left\|A^{r+1}x^{r+1} + B^{r+1}z + \Gamma^{-1}\lambda^r\right\|_\Gamma^2 \tag{16c}$$

$$z_{ij}^{r+1} = z_{ij}^r, \quad \text{if } e_{ij} \notin \mathcal{A}^{r+1} \tag{16d}$$

$$\lambda^{r+1} = \lambda^r + \Gamma\left(A^{r+1}x^{r+1} + B^{r+1}z^{r+1}\right) \tag{16e}$$

Algorithm 2. PGC Over Static Graphs

At iteration 0, let $B^T\lambda^0 = 0$, $z^0 = \frac{1}{2}M_+^T x^0$.

At each iteration $r+1$, update the variable blocks by:

$$x^{r+1} = \arg\min_x \ \langle G(x^r), x - x^r\rangle + h(x) + \langle \lambda^r, Ax + Bz^r\rangle$$
$$+ \frac{1}{2}\|Ax + Bz^r\|_\Gamma^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|x - x^r\|_\Omega^2 \tag{17a}$$

$$z^{r+1} = \arg\min_z \ \frac{1}{2}\left\|Ax^{r+1} + Bz + \Gamma^{-1}\lambda^r\right\|_\Gamma^2 \tag{17b}$$

$$\lambda^{r+1} = \lambda^r + \Gamma\left(Ax^{r+1} + Bz^{r+1}\right) \tag{17c}$$

Let us make a few comments about DySPGC. First, the penalty parameter used for the x-update for the proximal term $\|x - x^r\|^2$ is given by the matrix $\Omega^{r+1} + \eta^{r+1}I_{MN}$, where Ω^{r+1} is used as the conventional proximal regularizer, while η^{r+1} is used to mitigate the stochasticity in the gradient. Second, when the gradients are precisely known, we can set $\eta^{r+1} = 0$ for all r, then the x-update rule (16a) reduces to the following

$$x^{r+1} = \arg\min_x \ \left\langle G^{r+1}(x^r), x - x^r \right\rangle + h^{r+1}(x)$$
$$+ \frac{1}{2}\left\|A^{r+1}x + B^{r+1}z^r + \Gamma^{-1}\lambda^r\right\|_\Gamma^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|x - x^r\|^2_{\Omega^{r+1}}$$

where $G^{r+1}(x^r)$ is defined similarly as $\widetilde{G}^{r+1}(x^r, \xi^{r+1})$ (with inexact gradients replaced by the exact

gradients).

When we assume that the graph is static and the exact gradients are known, i.e., $\mathcal{G}_d^r = \mathcal{G}_d$ and $\widetilde{G}^{r+1}(x^r, \xi^{r+1}) = G(x^r)$ for all r, then the DySPGC reduces to the following proximal gradient consensus (PGC) algorithm.

We note that PGC is a *proximal* version of the conventional C-ADMM [6], [20], [33], where we have used the second order approximation $\langle G(x^r), x - x^r\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\|x - x^r\|_\Omega^2$ of the smooth function $g(x)$ in the x-step. Moreover, a matrix penalty Γ is used rather than a scalar one, as has been popular in the existing ADMM-based methods. More detailed comparison with existing consensus-based algorithms will be provided in Section V.

B. Distributed Implementation

Clearly both algorithms can be implemented in a distributed manner, in which the information needed for updating each variable can be obtained from its immediate neighbors. This is because in the original formulation (8) each node i is only coupled with its neighboring links $\{e_{ij}, e_{ji}\}_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}$, and each link pair $e_{ij}, e_{ji} \in \mathcal{A}$ is only related to its two neighboring nodes $\{i, j\} \in \mathcal{V}$. In this section we illustrate the distributed implementation of the PGC algorithm, because it takes a very simple form.

To write the algorithm compactly, define the *stepsize parameter* β_i as [recall $\widehat{\rho}_{ij} := 1/2(\rho_{ij} + \rho_{ji})$]

$$\beta_i := 2\bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \widehat{\rho}_{ij} + \omega_i/2\bigg),\ \forall\ i \in \mathcal{V}. \tag{18}$$

Let us specialize the weight matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}$ and define a new *stepsize matrix* $\Upsilon \in \mathbb{R}^{MN\times MN}$ as follows

$$W[i,j]=\begin{cases} \frac{\rho_{ji}+\rho_{ij}}{\sum_{\ell\in\mathcal{N}_i}(\rho_{\ell i}+\rho_{i\ell})+\omega_i} = \frac{\rho_{ji}+\rho_{ij}}{\beta_i}, & \text{if } e_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}, \\ \frac{\omega_i}{\sum_{\ell\in\mathcal{N}_i}(\rho_{\ell i}+\rho_{i\ell})+\omega_i} = \frac{w_i}{\beta_i}, & \forall\ i = j,\ i \in \mathcal{V} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{19}$$

$$\Upsilon := \text{diag}\{\beta_1, \cdots, \beta_N\} \otimes I_M \succ 0. \tag{20}$$

Clearly W is a row stochastic matrix and it satisfies (7). However, generally each W is not symmetric nor doubly stochastic, except when all β_i's are identical.

Surprisingly, Algorithm 2 admits a single-variable characterization, as we show in the following result.

Proposition 3.1: *The iteration* (17a) – (17c) *of Algorithm 2 (PGC) has the following compact char-*

acterization:

$$x^{r+1}-x^r+\Upsilon^{-1}(\zeta^{r+1}-\zeta^r)=\Upsilon^{-1}\left(-G\left(x^r\right)+G\left(x^{r-1}\right)\right)$$
$$+(W\otimes I_M)x^r-\frac{1}{2}(I_{MN}+W\otimes I_M)x^{r-1},\ \forall\ r\geq 1, \tag{21}$$

where $\zeta^{r+1}\in\mathbb{R}^{MN}$ is a vector of subgradients with $\zeta_i^{r+1}\in\partial h_i(x_i^{r+1}),\ \forall\ i$. In particular, each agent i implements the following iteration

$$x_i^{r+1}-x_i^r+\frac{1}{\beta_i}(\zeta_i^{r+1}-\zeta_i^r)=\frac{1}{\beta_i}\bigg(-\nabla g_i(x_i^r)+\nabla g_i(x_i^{r-1})\bigg)+\frac{1}{\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\widehat{\rho}_{ij}+\omega_i/2}\bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\widehat{\rho}_{ij}x_j^r+\frac{\omega_i}{2}x_i^r\bigg)$$
$$-\frac{1}{2}\bigg(x_i^{r-1}+\frac{1}{\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\widehat{\rho}_{ij}+\omega_i/2}\bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\widehat{\rho}_{ij}x_j^{r-1}+\frac{\omega_i}{2}x_i^{r-1}\bigg)\bigg):=c_i^{r+1},\ \forall\ r\geq 1. \tag{22}$$

The proof is relegated to Appendix A. Let us comment on how (21) can be carried out in practice. If $h\equiv 0$, then $\zeta^r=0,\ \forall\ r$. To perform (21) each agent i needs its past iterate x_i^r, x_i^{r-1} the stepsize β_i, the gradients $\nabla g_i(x_i^r),\ \nabla g_i(x_i^{r-1})$, as well as the weighted sum of x^r over its neighbors at the current and past iterations, $\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\widehat{\rho}_{ij}x_j^r$ and $\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\widehat{\rho}_{ij}x_j^{r-1}$. At iteration $r+1$, a given agent i only communicates with its neighbors $\mathcal{N}_i$.

When $h\neq 0$, the implementation of (21) is also simple. Assume that $x^0=x^{-1}=0$ and $\zeta^0=0$ for initialization. Then according to (22) we have $x_i^1+\frac{1}{\beta_i}\zeta_i^1=0$, so x_i^1 and ζ_i^1 can be obtained by solving the following problem

$$x_i^1=\arg\min_{x_i}\ h_i(x_i)+\frac{\beta}{2}x_i^2.$$

To obtain $(x_i^{r+1},\zeta_i^{r+1})$, $r\geq 1$, suppose ζ_i^r is available, then according to (22), we have

$$x_i^{r+1}+\frac{1}{\beta_i}\zeta_i^{r+1}=c_i^{r+1}+x_i^r+\frac{1}{\beta_i}\zeta_i^r,$$

where c_i^{r+1} is defined in (22). Finding x_i^{r+1} is equivalent to solving the following

$$x_i^{r+1}:=\mathrm{prox}_{h_i}^{\beta_i}\left(c_i^{r+1}+x_i^r+\frac{1}{\beta_i}\zeta_i^r\right). \tag{23}$$

Once x_i^{r+1} is obtained, we can compute ζ_i^{r+1} by

$$\zeta_i^{r+1}=\beta_i\left(x_i^r+c_i^{r+1}-x_i^{r+1}\right)+\zeta_i^r. \tag{24}$$

Clearly, as long as problem (23) can be solved easily, iteration (21) can be implemented efficiently in a distributed manner. The required information is the same as that of the smooth case discussed just now.

TABLE I: Main Convergence Results.

Scenario		Convergence Condition	Convergence Rate
Network Type	Gradient Type		
Static	Exact	$\Omega + \frac{1}{2}M_+(\Xi \otimes I_M)M_+^T - \widetilde{P}/2 \succ 0$	$\mathcal{O}(1/r)$
Static	Stochastic	$\Omega + \frac{1}{2}M_+(\Xi \otimes I_M)M_+^T - \widetilde{P} \succ 0$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{r})$
Random	Exact	$\Omega \succ \widetilde{P}/2$	$\mathcal{O}(1/r)$
Random	Stochastic	$\Omega \succ \widetilde{P}$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{r})$

IV. Convergence Analysis

We begin analyzing the (rate of) convergence of the proposed methods. Let us define a diagonal matrix of Lipschitz constants by

$$\widetilde{P} := \text{diag}\{P_1, \cdots, P_N\} \otimes I_M \in \mathbb{R}^{MN \times MN}. \tag{25}$$

Let $w := [x; z; \lambda]$ denote the vector of primal-dual iterates generated by PGC/DySPGC, and let w^* denote a vector of optimal primal-dual solutions for problem (P). Our main convergence results are summarized in Table I. All the proofs of this section are relegated to the Appendix.

A. Analysis for Static Graphs

We begin with analyzing the PGC algorithm (static graph and exact gradients). We have the following result.

Theorem 4.1: *Suppose Assumption 1 holds. Suppose $\mathcal{G}^r = \mathcal{G}$ for all r and $\mathcal{G}$ is connected. Then we have the following.*

(1) Algorithm 2 converges to a primal-dual optimal solution of problem (P) *if:*

$$2\Omega + M_+(\Xi \otimes I_M)M_+^T = \Upsilon(W \otimes I_M) + \Upsilon \succ \widetilde{P}. \tag{26}$$

(2) Assume that dom(h) is bounded, i.e., there exists a finite $C > 0$ such that

$$d_x := \sup_{\hat{x},\, \tilde{x} \in \textbf{dom}(h)} \|\hat{x} - \tilde{x}\| \leq C.$$

Suppose w^r is generated by Algorithm 2. Define

$$\bar{w}^{r+1} := \frac{1}{r+1}\sum_{t=0}^{r} w^t,\ d_z := \sup_{\hat{x},\, \tilde{x} \in \textbf{dom}(h)} \sqrt{\sum_{ij:e_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}} 2\rho_{ij}\|\hat{x}_i - \tilde{x}_j\|^2}.$$

Suppose the stepsize matrix satisfies

$$2\Omega + M_+(\Xi \otimes I_M)M_+^T = \Upsilon(W \otimes I_M) + \Upsilon \succ 2\widetilde{P}. \tag{27}$$

Then at a given iteration r, we have

$$f(\bar{x}^r) - f(x^*) + \rho\|A\bar{x}^r + B\bar{z}^r\| \leq \frac{1}{2r}\left(d_z^2 + d_\lambda^2(\rho) + \max_i \omega_i d_x^2\right) \tag{28}$$

where $d_\lambda(\rho) := \sup_{\lambda\in\mathcal{B}_\rho} \|\lambda - \lambda^0\|^2_{\Gamma^{-1}}$, $\mathcal{B}_\rho := \{\lambda \mid \|\lambda\| \leq \rho\}$.

A sufficient condition for (26) is that $2\Omega \succ \widetilde{P}$, which is equivalent to $\omega_i > P_i/2$ for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$. Compared with the existing convergence results on proximal-based ADMM such as [34] and [32], our bound for the proximal parameter ω_i is reduced by half. More importantly, no global information is needed at each agent to verify such condition. It is also interesting to note that the condition (26) is weaker than the condition (27) which guarantees the sublinear rate.

Next we analyze the algorithm for static graph and stochastic gradient (i.e., Algorithm 1 applied for a static graph).

Theorem 4.2: *Suppose Assumption 1 holds, and the graph is static and connected (with $\mathcal{G}^r = \mathcal{G}$ for all r). Suppose w^r is generated by Algorithm 1, and all the assumptions made in part (2) of Theorem 4.1 hold true. If additionally the penalty parameter η^r satisfies*

$$\eta^{r+1} = \sqrt{r+1}, \quad \forall\ r,$$

then we have the following rate estimate

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\left[f(\bar{x}^r) - f(x^*)\right] + \rho\|A\bar{x}^r + B\bar{z}^r\| \\ &\leq \frac{\sigma^2}{\sqrt{r}} + \frac{d_x^2}{2\sqrt{r}} + \frac{1}{2r}\left(d_z^2 + d_\lambda^2(\rho) + \max_i \omega_i d_x^2\right).\end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.1: In the previous two results, we have used

$$P(\bar{x}^r, \bar{z}^r) := f(\bar{x}^r) - f(x^*) + \rho\|A\bar{x}^r + B\bar{z}^r\|$$

to measure the quality of the solution. This is a reasonable measure: according to [34, Lemma 2.4], when ρ is large enough, $P(\bar{x}^r, \bar{z}^r) \leq \epsilon$ implies that

$$|f(\bar{x}^r) - f(x^*)| \leq \mathcal{O}(\epsilon), \quad \|A\bar{x}^r + B\bar{z}^r\| \leq \mathcal{O}(\epsilon).$$

That is, both the constraint violation and the objective gap are small. ■

Remark 4.2: The complexity bounds derived in Theorems 4.1 – 4.2 are dependent on $\max_i w_i$, which in turn depends on the network structure as well as the Lipschitz constants of the local gradients through (27). When the problem is badly scaled or the network is poorly connected []the largest eigenvalue of $M_+(I_M \otimes \Xi)M_+^T$ is small], then $\max_i w_i$ could be large. It is therefore of great interest to reduce the effect of w_i in the complexity bounds. ■

B. Analysis for Random Graphs

In this section we analyze the convergence properties of Algorithm 1 (DySPGC) for random graphs defined in Definition 2.1. The convergence claims are similar to those given in the previous section, but in the sense of convergence in expectation or with probability 1 (w.p.1).

We first analyze the simple case with exact gradient. Let $w := [x; z; \lambda]$ denote the iterates generated by DySPGC, and define a new function $J(x, z, \lambda)$ as

$$J(x, z, \lambda) := \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{\alpha_i} f_i(x_i) + \langle \lambda, A\Psi^{-1}x + B\Phi^{-1}z \rangle. \tag{29}$$

Define the following quantities

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{d}_x :&= \min_{\hat{x},\tilde{x}\in \mathbf{dom}(x)} (\tilde{x} - \hat{x})^T \Psi^{-1} (\tilde{x} - \hat{x}) \\
d_z :&= \sup_{\hat{x},\, \tilde{x}\in \mathbf{dom}(h)} \sqrt{\sum_{ij:e_{ij}\in\mathcal{A}} 2\rho_{ij}/p_{ij} \|\hat{x}_i - \tilde{x}_j\|^2} \\
\tilde{d}_\lambda(\rho) :&= \sup_{\rho\in\mathcal{B}_\rho} (\lambda^0 - \lambda)^T \Phi^{-1/2} \Gamma^{-1} \Phi^{-1/2} (\lambda^0 - \lambda),
\end{aligned}$$

where Ψ and Φ are given in (10).

The derivation of the following result is mostly based on that of Theorem 4.1.

Theorem 4.3: *Suppose Assumption 1 holds, and $\widetilde{G}(x^r, \xi^{r+1}) = G(x^r),\ \forall\ r$. Suppose $\{\mathcal{G}^r\}$ is generated according to Definition 2.1. Then we have the following.*
(1) If the following holds true

$$2\Omega \succ \widetilde{P}, \tag{30}$$

then Algorithm 1 generates a sequence w^r that converges w.p.1. to a primal-dual solution of problem (P).

(2) Define d_x, d_z and $\bar{w}^r$ similarly as in the statement of Theorem 4.1. Suppose the following holds true

$$\Omega \succ \widetilde{P}, \tag{31}$$

then Algorithm 1 generates a sequence $\bar{w}^r$ that satisfies

$$f(\bar{x}^r) - f(x^*) + \rho\|A\bar{x}^r + B\bar{z}^r\| \leq \frac{1}{2r}\left(2d_J + \tilde{d}_z^2 + \tilde{d}_\lambda^2(\rho) + \max_i \omega_i \tilde{d}_x^2\right)$$

where $d_J := \sup_{\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_\rho} J(x^0, z^0, \lambda)$.

It is interesting to note that the stepsize rules (30) and (31) are both implied by their respective counterparts (26) and (27), but the new rules are no longer related to the network structure.

Finally we analyze the case where the gradients are stochastic [i.e., Algorithm 1 (DySPGC) in its most general form].

Theorem 4.4: *Define $\bar{w}^r$ similarly as in the statement of Theorem 4.1. Suppose that*

$$\eta^{r+1} = \sqrt{r+1},\ \forall\ r,\ \textit{and}\quad \Omega \succ \widetilde{P}.$$

Then Algorithm 1 generates a sequence $\bar{w}^r$ that satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\left[f(\bar{x}^r) - f(x^*) + \rho\|A\bar{x}^r + B\bar{z}^r\|\right]\\ &\leq \frac{\sigma^2}{\sqrt{r}} + \frac{\max_i \omega_i(d_x^2 + 2\tilde{d}_x^2)}{2\sqrt{r}} + \frac{1}{2r}\left(2d_J + \tilde{d}_z^2 + \tilde{d}_\lambda^2(\rho) + \max_i \omega_i d_x^2\right)\end{aligned}$$

where d_J is defined in Theorem 4.3 -(2).

V. Comparison with Existing Algorithms

Our proposed DySPGC as well as its special case PGC is closely related to a few existing algorithms. In this section we provide a detailed account of such relations; see Table II for a summary.

TABLE II: Comparison of Different Algorithms with DySPGC.

Algorithm	Connection to DySPGC	Special Setting
IC-ADMM	Special Case	Static, $\widetilde{G} = \nabla g$, g composite
DLM	Special Case	Static, $h \equiv 0$, $W = W^T$, $\widetilde{G} = \nabla g$
EXTRA	Special Case	Static, $h \equiv 0$, $W = W^T$, $\widetilde{G} = \nabla g$
PG-EXTRA	Special Case	Static, $W = W^T$, $\widetilde{G} = \nabla g$
DSG	Different x-step	N/A (not special case)

A. Connection with the IC-ADMM

Recently, an IC-ADMM algorithm is proposed in [26], which solves the following problem in a distributed manner

$$\min_{y\in\mathbb{R}^M} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \ell_i(A_i y) + h_i(y), \tag{32}$$

where $\ell_i(\cdot)$ is a *strongly convex* function, and each A_i is a given matrix not necessarily having full column rank. Clearly, this problem is a special case of our consensus problem (3), with the additional requirement that the smooth part of the objective has the composite form (strongly convex plus linear mapping) given in (32). The IC-ADMM algorithm is a special case of our Algorithm 2 (PGC) applied to solve problem (32), with constant penalty parameter $\rho_{ij} = \rho > 0$, for all i, j. The analysis provided in [26, Theorem 1] requires that the stepsize $1/\beta_i$ to be proportional to the strong convexity constant of the function $\ell_i(\cdot)$, which can be tiny for badly scaled functions. In our analysis, no such condition is necessary.

B. Connection with the DLM algorithm

The Decentralized Linearized Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (DLM) proposed in [27] is closely related to IC-ADMM. The DLM solves (3) with $h_i \equiv 0$. Its basic iteration is again Algorithm 2 (PGC) with parameters $\rho_{ij} = \rho > 0$ and $\omega_i = \omega \geq 0$ for all i, j. The convergence condition in [27, Theorem 1] is given by (described using our notation)

$$\beta\lambda_{\min}\big(\frac{1}{2}M_+M_+^T\big) + \omega > \max_i P_i/2.$$

This condition is an immediate consequence of the condition (26) (with uniform ρ_{ij}'s and uniform ω_i's).

C. Connection with EXTRA

We show that the DySPGC can be viewed as a generalization of the EXTRA [13]. Consider applying Algorithm 2 (PGC) to problem (P) with a smooth objective (i.e., $h_i \equiv 0$ for all i). According to Proposition 3.1, the resulting iterates become

$$x^{r+1} = x^r + \Upsilon^{-1}\left(G(x^{r-1}) - G(x^r)\right) + \widehat{W}x^r - \widetilde{W}x^{r-1} \tag{33}$$

$$\text{with } \widehat{W} := W \otimes I_M, \quad \widetilde{W} := \frac{1}{2}(I_{MN} + W \otimes I_M). \tag{34}$$

Eq. (33) is precisely the EXTRA update developed in [13], except for the two relatively minor points:

1) In (33) a slightly more general *matrix stepsize* Υ^{-1} is used instead of the scalar stepsize used in EXTRA.
2) The EXTRA allows a slightly wider choice of $\widetilde{W}$, i.e., $1/2(I_{MN}+W\otimes I_M) \succeq \widetilde{W} \succeq W$, null$\{W-\widetilde{W}\}$ = span$\{\mathbf{1}\}$ and null$\{I_{MN}-\widetilde{W}\} \supseteq$ span$\{\mathbf{1}\}$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is an all 1 vector of appropriate size. However except for the common choice (34), these conditions are difficult (if not impossible) to verify in a fully distributed network.

When a single scalar stepsize is used (as was done in EXTRA), say $\beta = \beta_i = \beta_j > 0$ for all i, j, then we can perform either one of the following procedures to identify the parameters of the algorithm (depending on whether the weight matrix W is known *a priori*):

From Algorithm Parameters to Weight Matrix. Suppose the agents can select $\{\omega_i\}$ and $\{\rho_{ij}\}$. Then for any set of fixed $\{\rho_{ij}\}$'s, pick β and ω_i's such that

$$\omega_i = \beta - \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_j} (\rho_{ij}+\rho_{ji}) \geq 0, \quad \forall\ i.$$

Further, pick β large enough such that convergence conditions such as (26) are satisfied. Note that the weight matrix induced by such choice of parameters must be symmetric and doubly stochastic.

From Weight Matrix to Algorithm Parameters. Suppose the weight matrix W is given and fixed, and it is a symmetric doubly stochastic matrix. The symmetry of W implies $\beta_i = \beta_j = \beta$. For any fixed $\beta > 0$, one can easily find the parameters $\{\rho_{ij}\}$ and $\{\omega_i\}$ by letting $\rho_{ij}+\rho_{ji} = \beta \times W[i,j]$, $\omega_i = \beta \times W[i,i]$ for all ij such that $e_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}$. Again one should pick β large enough such that the convergence conditions (e.g.,(26)) are satisfied. Note that such construction implies that $\sum_{\ell\in\mathcal{N}_i}(\rho_{\ell i}+\rho_{i\ell})+\omega_i = \sum_{\ell\in\mathcal{N}_i}\beta W[i,\ell]+\beta W[i,i] = \beta$ (since $\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} W[i,j]+W[i,i]=1$), which recovers its original definition in (18).

To compare the convergence result in Theorem 4.1 and that of [13, Theorem 3.3], note that when the scalar stepsize is used, we have $\Upsilon = \beta I_{MN}$. Therefore a sufficient condition to guarantee the condition in Theorem 4.1 is that

$$\beta\lambda_{\min}\left(I_{MN}+W\otimes I_M\right) > \max_i P_i.$$

This is precisely the condition set forth in [13, Theorem 3.3].

From the above expression it is clear that β depends on *all* the local functions, therefore it has to be decided in a centralized manner. In contrast, the stepsize parameters in PGC can be chosen as: $\beta_i \geq P_i/2$ (cf. the remarks made after Theorem 4.1). The latter choice is simple, distributed implementable, and

more importantly it results in improved convergence speed in practice, especially when the curvatures of g_i's vary significantly, i.e., $\max_i P_i \gg \min_i P_i$.

D. Connection with PG-EXTRA

One can also show that the proposed Algorithm 2 (PGC) generalizes the PG-EXTRA [14].

Let us consider Algorithm 2 (PGC). According to the argument leading to (23), one can explicitly express (21) by

$$\begin{aligned} x_i^{r+1} &\overset{(23)}{=} \operatorname{prox}_{h_i}^{\beta_i}\big(c_i^{r+1} + x_i^r + \frac{1}{\beta_i}\zeta_i^r\big) \\ &\overset{(24)}{=} \operatorname{prox}_{h_i}^{\beta_i}\big(c_i^{r+1} + c_i^r + x_i^{r-1} + \frac{1}{\beta_i}\zeta_i^{r-1}\big) \\ &= \operatorname{prox}_{h_i}^{\beta_i}\big(\sum_{t=2}^{r+1} c_i^t + x_i^1 + \frac{1}{\beta_i}\xi_i^1\big). \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of c_i in (22) we have

$$\sum_{t=2}^{r+1} c_i^t = \frac{1}{\beta_i}\left(-\nabla g_i(x_i^r) + \nabla g_i(x_i^0)\right) + \widehat{W}_i x^r + \sum_{t=2}^{r}(\widehat{W}_i - \widetilde{W}_i)x^{t-1} - \widetilde{W}_i x^0$$

where $\widehat{W}_i$ and $\widetilde{W}_i$ denote the ith row of $\widehat{W}$ and $\widetilde{W}$ (as have been defined in (34)), respectively. Again by (22), and assume that $x^0 = 0$ and $\nabla g_i(x_i^{-1}) = 0$, we can check that

$$x_i^1 + \frac{1}{\beta_i}\xi_i^1 = -\frac{1}{\beta_i}\nabla g_i(x_i^0).$$

Combining the above three equalities we have

$$x_i^{r+1} = \operatorname{prox}_{h_i}^{\beta_i}\left(\frac{-1}{\beta_i}\nabla g_i(x_i^r) + \widehat{W}_i x^r + \sum_{t=1}^{r}(\widehat{W}_i - \widetilde{W}_i)x^{t-1}\right). \tag{35}$$

This is the PG-EXTRA proposed in [14, Algorithm 1].

E. Connection with the DSG Method

Below we show that Algorithm 2 (PGC) is closely related to the DSG iteration (2). Assume for simplicity that $h_i \equiv 0$ for all i. Suppose that the z and λ steps of the PGC remain the same while the x-step (17a) is replaced by

$$x^{r+1} = \arg\min_x \langle G(x^r), x - x^r\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\|Ax + Bz^r\|_\Gamma^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|x - x^r\|_\Omega^2.$$

That is, in the x-step we let $\lambda^r = 0$. The claim is that by such modification one recovers the DSG iteration (2). To argue this, we write down the optimality condition of the modified iteration as

$$\begin{aligned}
&G(x^r) + A^T\Gamma(Ax^{r+1} + Bz^r) + \Omega(x^{r+1} - x^r) = 0,\\
&B^T\lambda^r + B^T\Gamma(Ax^{r+1} + Bz^{r+1}) = 0,\\
&\lambda^{r+1} - \lambda^r - \Gamma\left(Ax^{r+1} + Bz^{r+1}\right) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Following the derivation of Proposition 3.1 until (44), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&G(x^r) + \alpha^{r+1} - \alpha^r + \frac{1}{2}M_+(\Xi \otimes I_M)M_+^T(x^{r+1} - x^r) + \Omega(x^{r+1} - x^r) = 0,\\
&\alpha^{r+1} = \alpha^r + \frac{1}{2}M_-(\Xi \otimes I_M)M_-^T x^{r+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that compared with (44), the first equality above has an additional term $-\alpha^r$. Plugging the second equality into the first one, we obtain

$$G(x^r) + \frac{1}{2}M_-(\Xi \otimes I_M)M_-^T x^{r+1} + \frac{1}{2}M_+(\Xi \otimes I_M)M_+^T(x^{r+1} - x^r) + \Omega(x^{r+1} - x^r) = 0.$$

Utilizing (15), and by the definition of β_i (18) and the definition of the weight matrix W in (19), we can write the above iteration compactly as

$$x^{r+1} = -\Upsilon^{-1}G(x^r) + \frac{1}{2}\left(I_{MN} + W \otimes I_M\right)x^r.$$

After picking a uniform scalar stepsize $\beta_i = \beta_j = \beta > 0$ (cf. Section V-C for how this can be done), we immediately get the DSG iteration (2) [with a weight matrix given by $\widetilde{W} = \frac{1}{2}(I_{MN} + W \otimes I_M)$].

Obviously, our convergence analysis does not work for this variant, as the x-update is no longer related to the dual variable λ. Indeed, to prove convergence of the DSG, an iteration-dependent and increasing β is needed, and such convergence is usually slower than $\mathcal{O}(1/r)$; see [13], [15], [16], [31] and the references therein. Nevertheless, the above observation reveals a fundamental connection between the ADMM-based method and the classical DSG method.

VI. Extension to Accelerated DySPGC

The relationship identified between the DySPGC and the EXTRA, PG-EXTRA, IC-ADMM etc. provides a systematic way to analyze and generalize various existing algorithms. In this section, we provide one such generalization which accelerates the DySPGC (hence the EXTRA, PG-EXTRA, IC-ADMM, etc). The algorithm is inspired by [32].

Algorithm 3. Accelerated DySPGC Over Static Graphs

At iteration 0, let $B^T\lambda^0 = 0$, $z^0 = z^{0,\mathrm{ag}} = \frac{1}{2}M_+^T x^0$.

At each iteration $r+1$, update the variable blocks by:

$$x^{r+1,\mathrm{md}} = (1-\nu^r)x^{r,\mathrm{ag}} + \nu^r x^r \tag{37a}$$

$$x^{r+1} = \arg\min \left\langle \widetilde{G}(x^{r+1,\mathrm{md}}, \xi^{r+1}), x - x^r \right\rangle + h(x) \tag{37b}$$
$$+ \frac{1}{2}\left\|Ax + Bz^r + \Gamma^{-1}\lambda^r\right\|_\Gamma^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|x - x^r\|^2_{\theta^r\Omega + \eta^{r+1}I_{MN}}$$

$$x^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}} = (1-\nu^r)x^{r,\mathrm{ag}} + \nu^r x^{r+1} \tag{37c}$$

$$z^{r+1} = \arg\min \frac{1}{2}\left\|Ax^{r+1} + Bz + \Gamma^{-1}\lambda^r\right\|_\Gamma^2 \tag{37d}$$

$$z^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}} = (1-\nu^r)z^{r,\mathrm{ag}} + \nu^r z^{r+1} \tag{37e}$$

$$\lambda^{r+1} = \lambda^r + \Gamma\left(Ax^{r+1} + Bz^{r+1}\right) \tag{37f}$$

$$\lambda^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}} = (1-\nu^r)\lambda^{r,\mathrm{ag}} + \nu^r\lambda^{r+1} \tag{37g}$$

For simplicity, we will restrict ourselves to the static graphs in this section. Let $\{\eta^r, \theta^r, \nu^r \geq 0\}$ denote a sequence of iteration-dependent parameters, whose values will be given shortly; Let $\{x^{r,\mathrm{md}}, x^{r,\mathrm{ag}}, z^{r,\mathrm{ag}}, \lambda^{r,\mathrm{ag}}\}$ denote a sequence of auxiliary variables. The proposed accelerated algorithm is given in the table above.

First note that $x^{r,\mathrm{ag}}, z^{r,\mathrm{ag}}, \lambda^{r,\mathrm{ag}}$ are convex combinations of all previous iterates $\{x^t\}_{t=1}^r$, $\{z^t\}_{t=1}^r$, $\{\lambda^t\}_{t=1}^r$, respectively. Second, $x^{r+1,\mathrm{md}}$ is an intermediate point on which the stochastic gradient is evaluated. Therefore in total there are three sequences related to the x update, resembling the Nestrov's acceleration scheme [35].

The convergence rate of Algorithm 3 can be analyzed similarly as in [32], we include the proof in the Appendix for completeness. Compared with the bound given in Theorem 4.2, the accelerated version is able to significantly reduce the scaling with respect to $\max_i w_i$.

Theorem 6.1: *Suppose that the assumptions made in Theorem 4.2 are true. Further let*

$$\nu^r = \frac{2}{r+1},\ \theta^r = \frac{2}{r},\ \eta^r = \sqrt{r},\ \varpi^r = \frac{2}{r(r+1)}. \tag{38}$$

Assume that the stepsize matrix satisfies

$$2\Omega + M_+(I_M \otimes \Xi)M_+^T = \Upsilon W + \Upsilon \succ 2\widetilde{P}. \tag{39}$$

Then the iterates generated by Algorithm 3 satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\big[f(x^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}}) - f(x^*) + \rho\|Ax^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}} + Bz^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}}\|\big]\\ &\leq \frac{1}{r}\big(d_z^2 + d_\lambda^2(\rho) + \frac{1}{r+1}\max_i \omega_i d_x^2\big) + \frac{2\sigma^2}{3}\frac{\sqrt{r+1}}{r} + \frac{\sqrt{r+1}}{r}d_x^2.\end{aligned}$$

where $d_\lambda(\rho) := \sup_{\lambda\in\mathcal{B}_\rho}\sup_{\tilde{\lambda}}\|\lambda - \tilde{\lambda}\|^2_{\Gamma^{-1}}$, $\mathcal{B}_\rho = \{\lambda \mid \|\lambda\| \leq \rho\}$, *and* $\rho > 0$ *is any finite constant.*

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Proposition 3.1

Let us split λ^r by $\lambda^r = [\delta^r; \gamma^r]$ where $\delta^r, \gamma^r \in \mathbb{R}^{2EM\times 1}$. The optimality conditions of (17a) – (17c) are

$$\begin{aligned}&G(x^r) + \zeta^{r+1} + A^T(\lambda^r + \Gamma(Ax^{r+1} + Bz^r))\\ &\qquad + \Omega(x^{r+1} - x^r) = 0 \qquad (40a)\\ &B^T(\lambda^r + \Gamma(Ax^{r+1} + Bz^{r+1})) = 0 \qquad (40b)\\ &\lambda^{r+1} - \lambda^r - \Gamma\left(Ax^{r+1} + Bz^{r+1}\right) = 0 \qquad (40c)\end{aligned}$$

where $\zeta^{r+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{NM}$ is a subgradient vector satisfying $\zeta_i^{r+1} \in h_i(x_i^{r+1}),\ \forall\ i$. First we show that

$$\delta^{r+1} = -\gamma^{r+1}, \quad \forall\ r \geq 0. \qquad (41)$$

At iteration 0 this is true due to the initialization $B^T\lambda^0 = 0$. At iteration $r \geq 0$, by (40b) and (40c) we have $B^T\lambda^{r+1} = 0$. This immediately implies $\delta_{ij}^{r+1} = -\gamma_{ij}^{r+1},\ \forall\ e_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}$.

Applying (41) to (40b), we have

$$z^{r+1} = \frac{1}{2}\left(A_1 + A_2\right)x^{r+1} = \frac{1}{2}M_+^T x^{r+1},\ \forall\ r \geq 0. \qquad (42)$$

Using the above identity, we have

$$Ax^{r+1} + Bz^{r+1} = \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} A_1 - A_2 \\ A_2 - A_1 \end{bmatrix} x^{r+1}.$$

This implies that

$$\delta^{r+1} = \delta^r + \frac{1}{2}(\Xi \otimes I_M) M_-^T x^{r+1}$$
$$\alpha^{r+1} = \alpha^r + \frac{1}{2} M_-(\Xi \otimes I_M) M_-^T x^{r+1}. \tag{43}$$

By (41), (42), we have (note, a new variable α is defined)

$$A^T\lambda^r = M_-\delta^r := \alpha^r,\ A^T\Gamma B z^{r+1} = \frac{1}{2} M_+(\Xi \otimes I_M) M_+^T x^{r+1}.$$

Utilizing the initial conditions $B^T\lambda^0 = 0$, and $z^0 = \frac{1}{2}M_+^T x^0$, the x-step optimality condition (40a) can be written as

$$G(x^r) + \zeta^{r+1} + \alpha^{r+1} + \frac{1}{2} M_+(\Xi \otimes I_M) M_+^T (x^{r+1} - x^r) + \Omega(x^{r+1} - x^r) = 0. \tag{44}$$

Plugging in the identities in (15b) and utilizing (43), the previous condition becomes

$$2\Big(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \frac{\rho_{ij}+\rho_{ji}}{2} + \frac{\omega_i}{2}\Big) x_i^{r+1} + \zeta^{r+1}$$
$$= -\nabla g_i(x_i^r) + \Big(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \frac{\rho_{ji}+\rho_{ij}}{2} + \frac{\omega_i}{2}\Big) x_i^r + \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \frac{\rho_{ji}+\rho_{ij}}{2} x_j^r + \frac{\omega_i}{2} x_i^r - \alpha_i^r,\ \forall\ i \tag{45a}$$
$$\alpha_i^{r+1} = \alpha_i^r + \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \frac{\rho_{ji}+\rho_{ij}}{2} x_i^{r+1} - \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \frac{\rho_{ji}+\rho_{ij}}{2} x_j^{r+1},\ \forall\ i. \tag{45b}$$

Next we remove the sequence $\{\alpha^r\}$ from the x iterations. This is the key step towards obtaining a single-variable characterization. To this end, we subtract (45a) by the same update for iteration r. By the definition of β_i in (18) we can derive the following update rule for node i at iteration $r+1$:

$$x_i^{r+1} - x_i^r + \frac{1}{\beta_i}(\zeta_i^{r+1} - \zeta_i^r) - \frac{1}{\beta_i}\left(-\nabla g_i(x_i^r) + \nabla g_i(x_i^{r-1})\right)$$
$$= \frac{1}{\beta_i}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \widehat{\rho}_{ij}(x_j^r - x_j^{r-1}) + (\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\omega_i}{2\beta_i})(x_i^r - x_i^{r-1}) + \frac{1}{\beta_i}(-\alpha_i^r + \alpha_i^{r-1})$$
$$\overset{(43)}{=} \frac{1}{\beta_i}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \widehat{\rho}_{ij}(x_j^r - x_j^{r-1}) + (\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\omega_i}{2\beta_i})(x_i^r - x_i^{r-1}) - \frac{1}{\beta_i}\Big(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \widehat{\rho}_{ij} x_i^r - \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \widehat{\rho}_{ij} x_j^r\Big)$$
$$= -\frac{1}{2}x_i^{r-1} + \frac{\omega_i}{2\beta_i}(x_i^r - x_i^{r-1}) + \frac{1}{2\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\widehat{\rho}_{ij} + \omega_i}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \widehat{\rho}_{ij}(x_j^r - x_j^{r-1}) + \frac{1}{2\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\widehat{\rho}_{ij} + \omega_i}\Big(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \widehat{\rho}_{ij} x_j^r + \frac{\omega_i}{2} x_i^r\Big)$$
$$= \frac{1}{\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\widehat{\rho}_{ij} + \omega_i/2}\Big(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \widehat{\rho}_{ij} x_j^r + \frac{\omega_i}{2} x_i^r\Big) - \frac{1}{2}\Big(x_i^{r-1} + \frac{1}{\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\widehat{\rho}_{ij} + \omega_i/2}\Big(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \widehat{\rho}_{ij} x_j^{r-1} + \frac{\omega_i}{2} x_i^{r-1}\Big)\Big).$$

Note that by the definition of W in (19), we have

$$\frac{1}{\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\widehat{\rho}_{ij}+\omega_i/2}\left(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\widehat{\rho}_{ij}x_j^r+\frac{\omega_i}{2}x_i^r\right)=\left[\left(W\otimes I_M\right)x^r\right]_i$$

which is simply a weighted average of x^r over all the neighbors of node i (including itself).

Writing in vector form and utilizing the definition of W in (19), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&x^{r+1}-x^r+\Upsilon^{-1}(\zeta^{r+1}-\zeta^r)-\Upsilon^{-1}\left(-G(x^r)+G(x^{r-1})\right)\\&\quad=(W\otimes I_M)x^r-\frac{1}{2}\left(I_{MN}+W\otimes I_M\right)x^{r-1},\quad\forall\ r\geq 1.\end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim.

B. Preliminary Results

We present a few preliminary results and definitions that will be used later for proof of convergence.

First we discuss the optimality condition for problem (P). Suppose that Assumption 1 holds. Let $y^*\in X^*$ denote an optimal solution of (3). Let $z_{ij}^*=y^*$, $(i,j)\in\mathcal{A}$ and $x_i^*=y^*$, for all i. Due to equivalence of problems (3) and (8), (z^*,x^*) is an optimal solution of (P). From the assumed Slater condition we know that problem (P) has a saddle point (x^*,z^*,λ^*) satisfying (where $L_0(\cdot)$ is given by (13) with $\Gamma\equiv 0$)

$$L_0(x^*,z^*;\lambda)\leq L_0(x^*,z^*;\lambda^*)\leq L_0(x,z;\lambda^*),\qquad\forall\ x\in\text{dom}(h),\ \forall\ z,\lambda. \tag{46}$$

Let us define the following vectors

$$w:=[x;z;\lambda],\quad F(x):=[A^T\lambda,B^T\lambda,-(Ax+Bz)^T]^T.$$

The second inequality in (46) is equivalent to the following

$$Q(w,w^*):=f(x)-f(x^*)+\langle w-w^*,F(w^*)\rangle\geq 0. \tag{47}$$

It also implies that the following (for some $\zeta^*\in\partial h(x^*)$)

$$U(w,w^*):=\langle x-x^*,\nabla g(x^*)+\zeta^*\rangle+\langle w-w^*,F(w^*)\rangle\geq 0. \tag{48}$$

It is easy to observe that for all $x\in\text{dom}(h)$ and all z,λ,

$$\langle w-w^*,F(w^*)\rangle=\langle w-w^*,F(w)\rangle. \tag{49}$$

Using the above identity, (47)–(48) are equivalent to the following two inequalities, respectively

$$Q(w,w^*) = f(x) - f(x^*) + \langle w - w^*, F(w)\rangle \geq 0, \tag{50a}$$

$$U(w,w^*) = \langle x - x^*, \nabla g(x^*) + \zeta^*\rangle + \langle w - w^*, F(w)\rangle \geq 0. \tag{50b}$$

Let us characterize the optimality condition for the iterates. Define a block diagonal matrix $H^{r+1}(\eta)$:

$$H^{r+1}(\eta) := \text{blkdg}\left\{\Omega^{r+1} + \eta I_{MN}, (B^{r+1})^T\Gamma B^{r+1}, \Gamma^{-1}\right\}.$$

Let $H(\eta)$ denote its time-invariant counterpart. Also define

$$F^r(x^r) := [(A^r)^T\lambda^r, (B^r)^T\lambda^r, -(A^r x^r + B^r z^r)^T]^T.$$

Using the fact that $\lambda^{r+1} = \lambda^r + \Gamma(Ax^{r+1} + Bz^{r+1})$, the optimality conditions for the subproblems of Algorithm 1 are given by [for all $x \in \text{dom}(h)$ and all z, λ]

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\langle \widetilde{G}^{r+1}(x^r, \xi^{r+1}) + \zeta^{r+1} + (A^{r+1})^T\left(\lambda^{r+1} + \Gamma B^{r+1}(z^r - z^{r+1})\right)\right.\\ &\left. + \left(\Omega^{r+1} + \eta^{r+1} I_{MN}\right)(x^{r+1} - x^r), x - x^{r+1}\right\rangle \geq 0,\end{aligned} \tag{51a}$$

$$\left\langle (B^{r+1})^T\lambda^{r+1}, z - z^{r+1}\right\rangle \geq 0, \tag{51b}$$

$$\left\langle \Gamma^{-1}(\lambda^{r+1} - \lambda^r) - \left(A^{r+1}x^{r+1} + B^{r+1}z^{r+1}\right), \lambda - \lambda^{r+1}\right\rangle \geq 0. \tag{51c}$$

Adding these conditions we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\langle x - x^{r+1}, \widetilde{G}^{r+1}(x^r, \xi^{r+1}) + \zeta^{r+1})\right\rangle + \langle w - w^{r+1}, F^{r+1}(w^{r+1})\rangle\\ &+ \langle (B^{r+1})^T\Gamma A^{r+1}(x - x^{r+1}) + (B^{r+1})^T\Gamma B^{r+1}(z - z^{r+1}), z^r - z^{r+1}\rangle\\ &- (w - w^{r+1})^T H^{r+1}(\eta^{r+1})(w^r - w^{r+1}) \geq 0,\ \forall\ x \in \text{dom}(h),\ \forall\ z, \lambda.\end{aligned}$$

Note that $(B^{r+1})^T\lambda^r = (B^r)^T\lambda^r = 0$ because $\lambda^r = [\delta^r; -\delta^r]$, and each B^{r+1} and B^r stacks two identical matrices. Using this fact and the optimality condition of the z-step (51b), the following is true for any optimal solution (z^*, x^*)

$$\left\langle (B^{r+1})^T\Gamma A^{r+1}(x^* - x^{r+1}) + (B^{r+1})^T\Gamma B^{r+1}(z^* - z^{r+1}), z^r - z^{r+1}\right\rangle \leq 0. \tag{52}$$

Combining the above two inequalities and rearranging terms, we obtain, for any $\tilde{w} := (x^*; y^*; \lambda)$

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\langle x^* - x^{r+1}, G(x^r) + \zeta^{r+1}\right\rangle + \langle \tilde{w} - w^{r+1}, F^{r+1}(w^{r+1})\rangle + \langle \tau^{r+1}, x^* - x^{r+1}\rangle \\ &\geq (\tilde{w} - w^{r+1})^T H^{r+1}(\eta^{r+1})(w^r - w^{r+1}),\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

where we have defined the *gradient error* as

$$\tau^{r+1} := \widetilde{G}^{r+1}(x^r, \xi^{r+1}) - \nabla G(x^r). \tag{54}$$

C. Proof of Theorem 4.1

We only prove the first part of the theorem. The second part is the consequence of Theorem 4.2.

As $\eta^r = 0$ for all r, and $\mathcal{G}^r = \mathcal{G}$ for all r, we denote $H := H(0)$. Applying the static version of (53) and let $w^* := (x^*, z^*, \lambda^*)$, we have

$$\left\langle x^* - x^{r+1}, G(x^r) + \zeta^{r+1}\right\rangle + \langle w^* - w^{r+1}, F(w^{r+1})\rangle \geq (w^* - w^{r+1})^T H(w^r - w^{r+1}).$$

By using the convexity of h twice, we obtain

$$\left\langle x^* - x^{r+1}, \xi^{r+1}\right\rangle = \left\langle x^* - x^{r+1}, \xi^{r+1} - \xi^* + \xi^*\right\rangle \leq \left\langle x^* - x^{r+1}, \xi^*\right\rangle, \tag{55}$$

where $\xi^* \in \partial h(x^*)$. Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle x^* - x^{r+1}, G(x^r)\rangle \\ &= \langle x^* - x^{r+1}, G(x^r) - G(x^*)\rangle + \langle x^* - x^{r+1}, G(x^*)\rangle \\ &= \langle x^* - x^r, G(x^r) - G(x^*)\rangle + \langle x^r - x^{r+1}, G(x^r) - G(x^*)\rangle + \langle x^* - x^{r+1}, G(x^*)\rangle \\ &\overset{\text{(i)}}{\leq} -\|G(x^*) - G(x^r)\|^2_{\widetilde{P}^{-1}} + \|x^r - x^{r+1}\|^2_{\widetilde{P}/4} \\ &\quad + \|G(x^r) - G(x^*)\|^2_{\widetilde{P}^{-1}} + \langle x^* - x^{r+1}, G(x^*)\rangle \\ &\leq \|x^r - x^{r+1}\|^2_{\widetilde{P}/4} + \langle x^* - x^{r+1}, G(x^*)\rangle\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

where in (i) we have used the Young's inequality: $\langle a, b\rangle \leq \|a\|^2/(2\epsilon) + \epsilon\|b\|^2/2$ where $\epsilon > 0$, and a key property due to Nestrov [35, Theorem 2.1.5]. Namely, if $g_i(x_i)$ is convex with Lipschitzian gradient (constant P_i), then

$$\frac{1}{P_i}\|\nabla g_i(x_i) - \nabla g_i(y_i)\|^2 \leq \langle \nabla g_i(x_i) - \nabla g_i(y_i), x_i - y_i\rangle, \ \forall \ x_i, y_i \in X.$$

Combining the optimality condition (50b) and the above two inequalities, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{4}\|x^r - x^{r+1}\|^2_{\widetilde{P}} \geq (w^* - w^{r+1})^T H(w^r - w^{r+1}),$$

which is equivalent to

$$\|w^* - w^{r+1}\|^2_H \leq \frac{1}{2}\|x^r - x^{r+1}\|^2_{\widetilde{P}} + \|w^* - w^r\|^2_H - \|w^r - w^{r+1}\|^2_H. \tag{57}$$

For time-invariant graph, (42) is true, which implies

$$(z^{r+1} - z^r)^T B^T \Gamma B (z^{r+1} - z^r) = \frac{1}{4}(x^{r+1} - x^r)^T M_+ B^T \Gamma B M_+^T (x^{r+1} - x^r) \tag{58}$$

Plugging this relation into (57) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|w^* - w^{r+1}\|^2_H \leq \|w^* - w^r\|^2_H - \|x^r - x^{r+1}\|_\Omega - \Gamma^{-1}\|\lambda^r - \lambda^{r+1}\|^2 \\ - \frac{1}{4}(x^{r+1} - x^r)^T M_+ \left(B^T \Gamma B M_+^T - 2\widetilde{P}\right)(x^{r+1} - x^r).\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

Therefore, as long as

$$\Omega + \frac{1}{4} M_+ B^T \Gamma B M_+^T - \frac{1}{2}\widetilde{P} \succ 0$$

or equivalently $2\Omega + M_+(\Xi \otimes I_M)M_+^T - \widetilde{P} \succ 0$, we will have $x^{r+1} \to x^r$, $\lambda^{r+1} \to \lambda^r$. By a standard argument (cf. the derivation in [26, (A2.22)-(A2.25)]), we can argue that every limit point of the sequence x^r and λ^r is a primal dual optimal solution of problem (P).

By noticing the following identity, which can be verified by using the definitions of W, Υ and M_+, the theorem is proved

$$2\Omega + M_+(\Xi \otimes I_M)M_+^T = \Upsilon(W \otimes I_M + I_{MN}).$$

D. Proof of Theorem 4.2

Note that the assumption of boundedness of x implies the boundedness of iterates $\{z^r\}$. This is because from the identity (42) we have $z_{ij}^{r+1} = \frac{1}{2}(x_i^{r+1} + x_j^{r+1})$ for all r. Therefore

$$\|z^r - z^*\|^2_{B^T\Gamma B} = \sum_{ij:e_{ij}\in\mathcal{A}} 2\rho_{ij}\left\|\frac{x_i^r + x_j^r}{2} - \frac{x_i^* + x_j^*}{2}\right\|^2 \leq d_z^2, \ \forall\ r.$$

By the convexity of h and g we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle x^* - x^{r+1}, \zeta^{r+1}\rangle &\le h(x^*) - h(x^{r+1})\\ \langle x^* - x^{r+1}, G(x^r)\rangle &= \langle x^* - x^r, G(x^r)\rangle + \langle x^r - x^{r+1}, G(x^r)\rangle\\ &\le g(x^*) - g(x^r) + g(x^r) - g(x^{r+1}) + \frac{1}{2}\|x^{r+1} - x^r\|^2_{\widetilde{P}}.\end{aligned}$$

For any given λ, plugging in $\tilde{w} := (x^*, z^*, \lambda)$ into (53) and use the previous two inequalities, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&-Q(w^{r+1}, \tilde{w}) = f(x^*) - f(x^{r+1}) + \langle \tilde{w} - w^{r+1}, F(w^{r+1})\rangle\\ &\ge (\tilde{w} - w^{r+1})^T H(\eta^{r+1})(w^r - w^{r+1}) - \langle \tau^{r+1}, x^* - x^{r+1}\rangle\\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}\|x^r - x^{r+1}\|^2_{\widetilde{P}}\\ &\overset{\text{(i)}}{\ge} (\tilde{w} - w^{r+1})^T H(\eta^{r+1})(w^r - w^{r+1}) - \langle \tau^{r+1}, x^* - x^r\rangle - \frac{\|\tau^{r+1}\|^2}{2\eta^{r+1}}\\ &\quad - \frac{\eta^{r+1}}{2}\|x^{r+1} - x^r\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|x^r - x^{r+1}\|^2_{\widetilde{P}}\\ &\ge \frac{1}{2}\|z^{r+1} - z^*\|^2_{B^T\Gamma B} - \frac{1}{2}\|z^r - z^*\|^2_{B^T\Gamma B} + \frac{1}{2}\|\lambda^{r+1} - \lambda\|^2_{\Gamma^{-1}}\\ &- \frac{1}{2}\|\lambda^r - \lambda\|^2_{\Gamma^{-1}} - \langle \tau^{r+1}, x^* - x^r\rangle - \frac{\|\tau^{r+1}\|^2}{2\eta^{r+1}}\\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\left(\|x^{r+1} - x^*\|^2_{\Omega + \eta^{r+1} I_{MN}} - \|x^r - x^*\|^2_{\Omega + \eta^{r+1} I_{MN}}\right)\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

where in (i) we have again used the Young's inequality; in the last inequality we have used the assumption (27) (cf. the derivation in (59)). Evaluating the LHS based on the average of the iterates $\bar{w}^{r+1}$, and using convexity, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&-Q(\bar{w}^{r+1}, \tilde{w}) = f(x^*) - f(\bar{x}^{r+1}) + \langle \tilde{w} - \bar{w}^{r+1}, F(\bar{w}^{r+1})\rangle\\ &\ge \frac{1}{r+1}\sum_{t=0}^{r}\left(f(x^*) - f(x^{t+1}) + \langle \tilde{w} - w^{t+1}, F(w^{t+1})\right)\rangle\\ &\ge -\frac{1}{2(r+1)}\|z^0 - z^*\|^2_{B^T\Gamma B} - \frac{1}{2(r+1)}\|\lambda^0 - \lambda\|^2_{\Gamma^{-1}}\\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2(r+1)}\sum_{t=0}^{r}\eta^{t+1}\left(\|x^{t+1} - x^*\|^2 - \|x^t - x^*\|^2\right)\\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2(r+1)}\|x^0 - x^*\|^2_{\Omega} - \frac{1}{r+1}\sum_{t=0}^{r}\left(\langle \tau^{t+1}, x^* - x^t\rangle + \frac{\|\tau^{t+1}\|^2}{2\eta^{t+1}}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

The rest of the proof follows the similar argument in the second part of the proof in [34, Theorem 2.2] [Eq. (25) – Eq. (30)]. We include it here for completeness.

First let us take the supremum of $Q(\bar{w}^{r+1}, \tilde{w})$ over the ball $\mathcal{B}_\rho$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\lambda\in\mathcal{B}_\rho}\left[f(\bar{x}^{r+1}) - f(x^*) + \langle \bar{w}^{r+1} - \tilde{w}, F(\bar{w}^{r+1})\rangle\right] \\
&= \sup_{\lambda\in\mathcal{B}_\rho}\Bigg[f(\bar{x}^{r+1}) - f(x^*) + \langle \bar{x}^{r+1} - x^*, A^T\lambda\rangle \\
&\quad + \langle \bar{z}^{r+1} - z^*, B^T\lambda\rangle + \langle \bar{\lambda}^{r+1} - \lambda, A\bar{x}^{r+1} + B\bar{z}^{r+1}\rangle\Bigg] \\
&= \sup_{\lambda\in\mathcal{B}_\rho}\left[f(\bar{x}^{r+1}) - f(x^*) + \langle \lambda, A\bar{x}^{r+1} + B\bar{z}^{r+1}\rangle\right] \\
&= f(\bar{x}^{r+1}) - f(x^*) + \rho\|A\bar{x}^{r+1} + B\bar{z}^{r+1}\|. \qquad (62)
\end{aligned}$$

Further, we have the following series of inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{t=0}^{r}\sqrt{t+1}\left(\|x^t - x^*\|^2 - \|x^{t+1} - x^*\|^2\right) \\
&\le \sum_{t=0}^{r}\|x^{t+1} - x^*\|^2(\sqrt{t+1} - \sqrt{t}) \\
&\le d_x^2\sqrt{r+1}. \qquad (63)
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the supreme of both sides of (61), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&f(\bar{x}^{r+1}) - f(x^*) + \rho\|A\bar{x}^{r+1} + B\bar{z}^{r+1}\| \\
&\le \frac{1}{2(r+1)}\left(d_z^2 + d_\lambda^2(\rho) + \max_i \omega_i d_x^2\right) + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{r+1}}d_x^2 - \frac{1}{r+1}\sum_{t=0}^{r}\left(\langle \tau^{t+1}, x^* - x^t\rangle + \frac{\|\tau^{t+1}\|^2}{2\eta^{t+1}}\right) \qquad (64)
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the expectation on both sides of the above inequality and utilize the assumption made in (12) about the stochastic gradient, and the fact that

$$\sum_{t=0}^{r}\frac{1}{\sqrt{t+1}} \le 2\sqrt{r+1}$$

we arrive at the desired bound.

E. Proof of Theorem 4.3

Our proof is motivated by [22], [30]. Suppose at iteration r we have iterate $w^r = (x^r, z^r, \lambda^r)$ and we are about to execute Algorithm 1. Consider the *virtual* sequence $(\hat{x}^{r+1}, \hat{z}^{r+1}, \hat{\lambda}^{r+1})$ generated by Algorithm 1 (based on w^r) with all nodes and edges being active (i.e., with $\mathcal{A}^{r+1} = \mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{V}^{r+1} = \mathcal{V}$).

Then from (57) in the proof of Theorem 4.1, we must have

$$\|w^* - \hat{w}^{r+1}\|_H^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\|x^r - \hat{x}^{r+1}\|_{\widetilde{P}}^2 + \|w^* - w^r\|_H^2 - \|w^r - \hat{w}^{r+1}\|_H^2. \tag{65}$$

Define the following auxiliary sequences

$$\begin{aligned}
D_x(x^{r+1}, x^*) :&= (x^* - x^{r+1})^T \Psi^{-1/2} \Omega \Psi^{-1/2} (x^* - x^{r+1}) \\
D_z(z^{r+1}, z^*) :&= (z^* - z^{r+1})^T \Phi^{-1/2} B^T \Gamma B \Phi^{-1/2} (z^* - z^{r+1}) \\
D_\lambda(\lambda^{r+1}, \lambda^*) :&= (\lambda^* - \lambda^{r+1})^T \Phi^{-1/2} \Gamma^{-1} \Phi^{-1/2} (\lambda^* - \lambda^{r+1}),
\end{aligned}$$

where Ψ and Φ are given in (10). Also define $\mathcal{F}^r = \{x^t, z^t, \lambda^t, \mathcal{G}_d^t, t = 1, \cdots, r\}$ as the filtration up to iteration r. The following is easy to verify

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[D_x(x^{r+1}, x^*)|\mathcal{F}^r\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\omega_i}{\alpha_i}\|x_i^{r+1} - x^*\|^2\right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \|\hat{x}_i^{r+1} - x^*\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N (1-\alpha_i)\frac{\omega_i}{\alpha_i}\|x_i^r - x^*\|^2 \\
&= D_x(x^r, x^*) + \|x^* - \hat{x}^{r+1}\|_\Omega^2 - \|x^* - x^r\|_\Omega^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

Using the same argument, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[D_z(z^{r+1}, z^*)|\mathcal{F}^r\right] = D_z(z^r, z^*) + \|z^* - \hat{z}^{r+1}\|_{B^T\Gamma B}^2 - \|z^* - z^r\|_{B^T\Gamma B}^2 \tag{67}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[D_\lambda(\lambda^{r+1}, \lambda^*)|\mathcal{F}^r\right] = D_\lambda(\lambda^r, \lambda^*) + \|\lambda^* - \hat{\lambda}^{r+1}\|_{\Gamma^{-1}}^2 - \|\lambda^* - \lambda^r\|_{\Gamma^{-1}}^2. \tag{68}$$

Summing up (66) – (68) and utilizing (65), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[D_x(x^{r+1}, x^*)|\mathcal{F}^r\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[D_z(z^{r+1}, z^*)|\mathcal{F}^r\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[D_\lambda(\lambda^{r+1}, \lambda^*)|\mathcal{F}^r\right] \\
&\leq D_x(x^r, x^*) + D_z(z^r, z^*) + D_\lambda(\lambda^r, \lambda^*) + \frac{1}{2}\|x^r - \hat{x}^{r+1}\|_{\widetilde{P}}^2 \\
&\quad - (w^r - \hat{w}^{r+1})^T H (w^r - \hat{w}^{r+1}) \\
&\leq D_x(x^r, x^*) + D_z(z^r, z^*) + D_\lambda(\lambda^r, \lambda^*) - (\hat{x}^{r+1} - x^r)^T \left(\Omega - \widetilde{P}/2\right)(\hat{x}^{r+1} - x^r) - \|\lambda^r - \hat{\lambda}^{r+1}\|_{\Gamma^{-1}}^2
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have removed the term $(\hat{z}^{r+1} - z^r)^T B^T \Gamma B (\hat{z}^{r+1} - z^r) \succeq 0$. Using the assumption (30), we conclude that the sequence $D_x(x^r, x^*) + D_z(z^r, z^*) + D_\lambda(\lambda^r, \lambda^*)$ is a nonnegative almost supermartingale, which is convergent by the nonnegative almost supermartigale convergence

theorem [36, Theorem 1]:

$$D_x(x^r, x^*),\ D_z(z^r, z^*),\ D_\lambda(\lambda^r, \lambda^*) \text{ are bounded and converges w.p.1.}$$
$$\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \|\lambda^r - \hat{\lambda}^{r+1}\|^2 \leq \infty, \quad \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \|x^r - \hat{x}^{r+1}\|^2 \leq \infty.$$

Then again by a standard argument (cf. [22]) we conclude that (x^r, z^r, λ^r) as well as $(\hat{x}^r, \hat{z}^r, \hat{\lambda}^r)$ converge with probability one to a primal-dual solution of problem (P).

F. Proof of Theorem 4.4

Again we prove by utilizing the full iterates $\hat{w} := (\hat{x}^{r+1}, \hat{z}^{r+1}, \hat{\lambda}^{r+1})$. Define $\tilde{w} := (x^*, z^*, \lambda)$ for any fixed λ. From the derivation leading to (60) we known that under the condition $\Omega \succ \widetilde{P}$, the full sequence satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
&- Q(\hat{w}^{r+1}, \tilde{w}) = f(x^*) - f(\hat{x}^{r+1}) + \langle \tilde{w} - \hat{w}^{r+1}, F(\hat{w}^{r+1}) \rangle \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}\|\hat{z}^{r+1} - z^*\|^2_{B^T\Gamma B} - \frac{1}{2}\|z^r - z^*\|^2_{B^T\Gamma B} + \frac{1}{2}\|\hat{\lambda}^{r+1} - \lambda\|^2_{\Gamma^{-1}} \\
&+ \frac{1}{2}\left(\|\hat{x}^{r+1} - x^*\|^2_{\Omega + \eta^{r+1} I_{MN}} - \|x^r - x^*\|^2_{\Omega + \eta^{r+1} I_{MN}}\right) \\
&- \frac{1}{2}\|\lambda^r - \lambda\|^2_{\Gamma^{-1}} - \langle \tau^{r+1}, x^* - x^r \rangle - \frac{\|\tau^{r+1}\|^2}{2\eta^{r+1}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

Notice that the following is true

$$\langle \tilde{w} - \hat{w}^{r+1}, F(\hat{w}^{r+1}) \rangle = \langle \tilde{w} - \hat{w}^{r+1}, F(\tilde{w}) \rangle = -\langle \lambda, A\hat{x}^{r+1} + B\hat{z}^{r+1} \rangle. \tag{70}$$

Then it is easy to verify that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\langle \tilde{w} - \hat{w}^{r+1}, F(\hat{w}^{r+1}) \rangle | \mathcal{F}^r\Big] = -\langle \lambda, A\Psi\hat{x}^{r+1} + B\Phi\hat{z}^{r+1} \rangle - \langle \lambda, Ax^r + Bx^r \rangle + \langle \lambda, A\Psi x^r + B\Phi z^r \rangle. \tag{71}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{i=1}^{N} f_i(x_i^{r+1}) \big| \mathcal{F}^r\Big] = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_i f_i(\hat{x}_i^{r+1}) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} (1 - \alpha_i) f_i(x_i^r). \tag{72}$$

Using (71) – (72) and the definition of $J(\cdot)$ in (29), the conditional expectation of $J(\cdot)$ can be expressed as below

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[J(x^{r+1}, z^{r+1}, \lambda)|\mathcal{F}^r] \\
&= J(x^r, z^r, \lambda) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} f_i(\hat{x}_i^{r+1}) + \langle \lambda, A\hat{x}^{r+1} + B\hat{z}^{r+1} \rangle - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} f_i(x_i^r) + \langle \lambda, Ax^r + Bz^r \rangle \right) \qquad (73) \\
&\overset{(70)}{=} J(x^r, z^r, \lambda) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} f_i(\hat{x}_i^{r+1}) - \langle \tilde{w} - \hat{w}^{r+1}, F(\hat{w}^{r+1}) \rangle - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} f_i(x_i^r) - \langle \tilde{w} - w^r, F(w^r) \rangle \right) \\
&= J(x^r, z^r, \lambda) + Q(\hat{w}^{r+1}, \tilde{w}) - Q(w^r, \tilde{w}).
\end{aligned}$$

Let us define

$$\widetilde{D}_x(x^{r+1}, x^*) := \eta^{r+1}(x^* - x^{r+1})^T \Psi^{-1}(x^* - x^{r+1}),$$

then its conditional expectation is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\widetilde{D}_x(x^{r+1}, x^*)|\mathcal{F}^r \right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\eta^{r+1}}{\alpha_i} \|x_i^{r+1} - x^*\|^2 \right] \\
&= \widetilde{D}_x(x^r, x^*) + \|x^* - \hat{x}^{r+1}\|_{\eta^{r+1} I_{MN}} - \|x^* - x^r\|^2_{\eta^{r+1} I_{MN}} + (\sqrt{r+1} - \sqrt{r}) \|x^r - x^*\|^2_{\Psi^{-1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging (69) and (66) – (68) into (73), we obtain a bound on the conditional expectation of $J(\cdot)$, given below

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[J(x^{r+1}, z^{r+1}, \lambda)|\mathcal{F}^r] \\
&\leq J(x^r, z^r, \lambda) - Q(w^r, \tilde{w}) + \frac{1}{2}\big(D_z(z^r, z^*) - \mathbb{E}[D_z(z^{r+1}, z^*)] \big) + (\sqrt{r+1} - \sqrt{r}) \|x^r - x^*\|^2_{\Psi^{-1}} \qquad (74) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2}\big(D_\lambda(\lambda^r, \lambda) - \mathbb{E}[D_\lambda(\lambda^{r+1}, \lambda)] \big) + \frac{1}{2}\big(D_x(x^r, x^*) - \mathbb{E}[D_x(x^{r+1}, x^*)] \big) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}\big(\widetilde{D}_x(x^r, x^*) - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{D}_x(x^{r+1}, x^*)] \big) + \langle \tau^{r+1}, x^* - x^r \rangle + \frac{\|\tau^{r+1}\|^2}{2\eta^{r+1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us define $\bar{x}^{r+1} = \frac{1}{r+1} \sum_{t=0}^{r} x^t$ and $\bar{z}^{r+1}$ similarly. Taking expectation wrt $\mathcal{F}^r$ and summing over t,

(74) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[Q(\bar{w}^r,\tilde{w})\right] &\leq \frac{1}{r+1}\mathbb{E}[J(x^0,z^0,\lambda)]+\frac{1}{2(r+1)}\mathbb{E}[D_z(z^0,z^*)]+\frac{1}{2(r+1)}\mathbb{E}[D_\lambda(\lambda^0,\lambda)]\\ &+\frac{1}{r+1}\sum_{t=0}^{r}(\sqrt{t+1}-\sqrt{t})\|x^t-x^*\|^2_{\Psi^{-1}}+\frac{1}{2(r+1)}\mathbb{E}[D_x(x^0,x^*)]+\frac{1}{2(r+1)}\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{D}_x(x^0,x^*)]\\ &+\frac{1}{r+1}\sum_{t=0}^{r}\left(\langle\tau^{t+1},x^*-x^t\rangle+\frac{\|\tau^{t+1}\|^2}{2\eta^{t+1}}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

By taking the superior of both sides over $\mathcal{B}_\rho := \{\lambda \mid \|\lambda\| \leq \rho\}$, and plugging in the definition of $Q(\bar{w}^r,\tilde{w})$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\big[\sum_{i=1}^{N} f_i(\bar{x}_i^r)-f(x^*)+\rho\|A\bar{x}^r+B\bar{y}^r\|\big]\\ &\leq \frac{1}{r+1}\sup_{\lambda\in\mathcal{B}_\rho} J(x^0,z^0,\lambda)+\frac{1}{2(r+1)}D_z(z^0,z^*)+\frac{1}{2(r+1)}\sup_{\lambda\in\mathcal{B}_\rho} D_\lambda(\lambda^0,\lambda)+\frac{1}{r+1}D_x(x^0,x^*)\\ &+\frac{1}{2(r+1)}\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{D}_x(x^0,x^*)]+\frac{1}{r+1}\sum_{t=0}^{r}\left(\langle\tau^{t+1},x^*-x^t\rangle+\frac{\|\tau^{t+1}\|^2}{2\eta^{t+1}}\right)\\ &+\frac{1}{r+1}\sum_{t=0}^{r}(\sqrt{r+1}-\sqrt{r})\|x^r-x^*\|^2_{\Psi^{-1}} \end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

The rest of the proof follows the last part of the proof of Theorem 4.2.

G. Proof of Theorem 6.1

We first provide a lemma that bounds the quantity $Q(\cdot,\cdot)$ defined in (47).

Lemma A.1: *Let $\tilde{w} := (x^*,y^*,\lambda)$ for any given λ. We have the following estimate for $Q(w^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}},\tilde{w})$*

$$\begin{aligned}&Q(w^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}},\tilde{w})-(1-\nu^r)Q(w^{r,\mathrm{ag}},\tilde{w})\\ &\leq \nu^r\left(\langle\nabla g(x^{r+1,\mathrm{md}})+\zeta^*,x^{r+1}-x^*\rangle+\frac{\nu^r}{2}\|x^{r+1}-x^r\|^2_{\widetilde{P}}+\langle w^{r+1}-\tilde{w},F(\tilde{w})\rangle\right) \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

for some $\zeta^*\in\partial h(x^*)$.

Proof. From the definition of $x^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}}$, $x^{r+1,\mathrm{md}}$ we have

$$x^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}}-x^{r+1,\mathrm{md}}=\nu^r(x^{r+1}-x^r). \tag{78}$$

First it is easy to show that for any feasible x, we have (cf. [32, 2.16])

$$\begin{aligned} & g(x^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}}) - (1-\nu^r) g(x^{r,\mathrm{ag}}) \\ & \leq \nu^r g(x^*) + \nu^r \langle \nabla g(x^{r+1,\mathrm{md}}), x^{r+1} - x^* \rangle + \frac{(\nu^r)^2}{2} \|x^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}} - x^{r+1,\mathrm{md}}\|_{\widetilde{P}}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

Using this result, we have the following series of inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} & Q(w^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}}, \tilde{w}) - (1-\nu^r) Q(w^{r,\mathrm{ag}}, \tilde{w}) \\ & = (f(x^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}}) - f(x^*)) - (1-\nu^r)(f(x^{r,\mathrm{ag}}) - f(x^*)) \\ & \qquad + \langle A x^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}} + B z^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}}, \lambda \rangle - (1-\nu^r) \langle A x^{r,\mathrm{ag}} + B z^{r,\mathrm{ag}}, \lambda \rangle \\ & \leq \nu^r (h(x^{r+1}) - h(x^*)) + \nu^r \langle \nabla g(x^{r+1,\mathrm{md}}), x^{r+1} - x^* \rangle \\ & \qquad + \frac{(\nu^r)^2}{2} \|x^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}} - x^{r+1,\mathrm{md}}\|_{\widetilde{P}}^2 + \nu^r \langle A x^{r+1} + B z^{r+1}, \lambda \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality uses (79), the convexity of $h(\cdot)$ and the update rule of $x^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}}$. ■

We then proceed to prove Theorem 6.1. Let us define $\varpi = \frac{2}{(r+1)r}$. From (38) one can check that the following two identities hold

$$\varpi^r = (1-\nu^r)\varpi^{r-1}, \quad \nu^r/\varpi^r = r.$$

Let us define

$$H(\theta, \eta) := \mathrm{blkdg}\left\{\theta\Omega + \eta I_{MN}, (B)^T \Gamma B, \Gamma^{-1}\right\}$$

Similarly as in (53), we can derive (for some $\zeta^{r+1} \in \partial h(x^{r+1})$)

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle x - x^{r+1}, \nabla g(x^{r+1,\mathrm{md}}) + \zeta^{r+1} \right\rangle + \langle w - w^{r+1}, F(w^{r+1}) \rangle + \langle \tau^{r+1}, x - x^{r+1} \rangle \\ & \geq (w - w^{r+1})^T H(\theta^r, \eta^{r+1})(w^r - w^{r+1}), \quad \forall\ x \in \mathrm{dom}(h),\ \forall\ z, \lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Utilizing the fact that $\langle \tilde{w} - w^{r+1}, F(w^{r+1}) \rangle = \langle \tilde{w} - w^{r+1}, F(\tilde{w}) \rangle$ and that $\langle x^* - x^{r+1}, \zeta^{r+1} - \zeta^* \rangle \leq 0$ for any $\zeta^{r+1} \in \partial h(x^{r+1})$, we plugging in $\tilde{w} := (x^*, y^*, \lambda)$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle x^* - x^{r+1}, \nabla g(x^{r+1,\mathrm{md}}) + \zeta^* \right\rangle + \langle \tilde{w} - w^{r+1}, F(\tilde{w}) \rangle + \langle \tau^{r+1}, x^* - x^{r+1} \rangle \\ & \geq (\tilde{w} - w^{r+1})^T H(\theta^r, \eta^{r+1})(w^r - w^{r+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma A.1, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&Q(w^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}},\tilde{w})-(1-\nu^r)Q(w^{r,\mathrm{ag}},\tilde{w})\\
&\leq \nu^r(\tilde{w}-w^{r+1})^T H(\theta^r,\eta^{r+1})(w^{r+1}-w^r)+\frac{(\nu^r)^2}{2}\|x^{r+1}-x^r\|^2_{\widetilde{P}}+\nu^r\langle\tau^{r+1},x^*-x^{r+1}\rangle. \qquad (80)
\end{aligned}$$

From the assumption Ω should satisfy (39). Using such assumed bound, the definition of ν^r and θ^r, and the fact that $\nu^r<1$ and $M_+(I_M\otimes\Xi)M_+^T\succeq 0$, we have

$$\frac{\theta^r}{2}\Omega+\frac{1}{4}M_+(I_M\otimes\Xi)M_+^T\succ\frac{\nu^r}{2}\widetilde{P}. \qquad (81)$$

Applying the same derivation as in (60), and divide both sides of (80) by ϖ^r, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\varpi^r}Q(w^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}},\tilde{w})-\frac{1-\nu^r}{\varpi^r}Q(w^{r,\mathrm{ag}},\tilde{w})\\
&=\frac{1}{\varpi^r}Q(w^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}},\tilde{w})-\frac{1}{\varpi^{r-1}}Q(w^{r,\mathrm{ag}},\tilde{w})\\
&\leq\frac{\nu^r}{\varpi^r}\left((\tilde{w}-w^{r+1})^T H(\theta^r,\eta^{r+1})(w^{r+1}-w^r)+\frac{\nu^r}{2}\|x^{r+1}-x^r\|^2_{\widetilde{P}}+\langle\tau^{r+1},x^*-x^{r+1}\rangle\right)\\
&\leq\frac{\nu^r}{2\varpi^r}\left(-\|z^{r+1}-z^*\|^2_{B^T\Gamma B}+\|z^r-z^*\|^2_{B^T\Gamma B}\right)+\frac{\nu^r}{2\varpi^r}\left(-\|\lambda^{r+1}+\lambda\|^2_{\Gamma^{-1}}+\|\lambda^r-\lambda\|^2_{\Gamma^{-1}}\right)\\
&-\quad\frac{\nu^r}{2\varpi^r}\left(\|x^{r+1}-x^*\|^2_{\theta^r\Omega+\eta^{r+1}I_{MN}}+\|x^r-x^*\|^2_{\theta^r\Omega+\eta^{r+1}I_{MN}}\right)+\frac{\nu^r}{\varpi^r}\langle\tau^{r+1},x^*-x^r\rangle+\frac{\nu^r}{\varpi^r}\frac{\|\tau^{r+1}\|^2}{2\eta^{r+1}}. \qquad (82)
\end{aligned}$$

Let us then analyze the successive sum of the RHS of the above inequality. Note that the sequences $\{\frac{\nu^r}{2\varpi^r},\frac{\nu^r\eta^{r+1}}{2\varpi^r}\}$ are both increasing sequences, and the sequence $\frac{\nu^r\theta^r}{2\varpi^r}$ is non-increasing. Thus from [32, Lemam 2.4] we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{t=1}^r\frac{\nu^t}{2\varpi^t}\left(-\|z^{t+1}-z^*\|^2_{B^T\Gamma B}+\|z^t-z^*\|^2_{B^T\Gamma B}\right)\leq\frac{\nu^r}{2\varpi^r}d_z^2,\\
&\sum_{t=1}^r\frac{\nu^t}{2\varpi^t}\left(-\|\lambda^{t+1}+\lambda\|^2_{\Gamma^{-1}}+\|\lambda^t-\lambda\|^2_{\Gamma^{-1}}\right)\leq\frac{\nu^r}{2\varpi^r}\sup_{\lambda^t}\|\lambda-\lambda^t\|^2_{\Gamma^{-1}},\\
&\sum_{t=1}^r\frac{\nu^t\eta^{t+1}}{2\varpi^t}\left(-\|x^{t+1}-x^*\|^2+\|x^t-x^*\|^2\right)\leq\frac{\nu^r\eta^r}{2\varpi^r}d_x^2,\\
&\sum_{t=1}^r\frac{\nu^t\theta^t}{2\varpi^t}\left(-\|x^{t+1}-x^*\|^2_{\Omega}+\|x^t-x^*\|^2_{\Omega}\right)\leq\frac{\nu^1\theta^1}{2\varpi^1}\max_i\omega_i\|x^1-x^*\|^2=\max_i\omega_i d_x^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining these results, we obtain

$$Q(w^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}},\tilde{w}) \leq \varpi^r Q(w^{1,\mathrm{ag}},\tilde{w}) + \frac{\nu^r}{2}\left(d_z^2 + \sup_{\lambda^t}\|\lambda-\lambda^t\|^2_{\Gamma^{-1}} + \eta^r d_x^2\right) + \varpi^r \max_i d_x^2\omega_i$$
$$+ \varpi^r \sum_{t=1}^r \left(\frac{\nu^t}{\varpi^t}\frac{\|\tau^{t+1}\|^2}{2\eta^{t+1}} + \frac{\nu^t}{\varpi^t}\langle \tau^{t+1}, x^* - x^t\rangle\right). \tag{83}$$

Notice that from the derivation in (62) we have

$$\sup_{\lambda\in\mathcal{B}_\rho} Q(w^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}},\tilde{w}) = f(x^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}}) - f(x^*) + \rho\|Ax^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}} + Bz^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}}\|,\ \forall\ \rho \geq 0. \tag{84}$$

Therefore we obtain (noting the fact that $\varpi^0 = (1-\nu^1)\varpi^1 = 0$)

$$f(x^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}}) - f(x^*) + \rho\|Ax^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}} + Bz^{r+1,\mathrm{ag}}\|$$
$$\leq \frac{\nu^r}{2}\left(d_z^2 + d_\lambda^2(\rho) + \eta^r d_x^2\right) + \varpi^r \max_i \omega_i d_x^2 + \varpi^r \sum_{t=1}^r \left(\frac{\nu^t}{\varpi^t}\frac{\|\tau^{t+1}\|^2}{2\eta^{t+1}} + \frac{\nu^t}{\varpi^t}\langle \tau^{t+1}, x^* - x^t\rangle\right). \tag{85}$$

Taking expectation on both sides of the above inequality and utilizing

$$\varpi^r \sum_{t=1}^r \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\nu^t}{\varpi^t}\frac{\|\tau^{t+1}\|^2}{2\eta^{t+1}}\right] = \sigma^2\varpi^r\sum_{t=1}^r \frac{\nu^t}{2\varpi^t\eta^{t+1}} = \frac{\sigma^2}{r(r+1)}\sum_{t=1}^r \frac{t}{\sqrt{t+1}} \leq \frac{2\sigma^2}{3}\frac{\sqrt{r+1}}{r},$$
$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\nu^r}{\varpi^r}\langle \tau^{r+1}, x^* - x^r\rangle\right] = 0,\ \forall\ r. \tag{86}$$

we can obtain the desired bound.

REFERENCES

[1] J. Tsitsiklis, "Problems in decentralized decision making and computation," 1984, Ph.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

[2] Lin Xiao, Stephen Boyd, and Seung-Jean Kim, "Distributed average consensus with least-mean-square deviation," *J. Parallel Distrib. Comput.*, vol. 67, no. 1, pp. 33–46, Jan. 2007.

[3] P.A. Forero, A. Cano, and G.B. Giannakis, "Distributed clustering using wireless sensor networks," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 707–724, Aug 2011.

[4] G. Mateos, J. A. Bazerque, and G. B. Giannakis, "Distributed sparse linear regression," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Processing*, 2010 (submitted).

[5] S. Shalev-Shwartz and T. Zhang, "Proximal stochastic dual coordinate ascent methods for regularzied loss minimization," *Journal of Machine Learning Rsearch*, vol. 14, pp. 567–599, 2013.

[6] I. Schizas, A. Ribeiro, and G. Giannakis, "Consensus in ad hoc wsns with noisy links - part i: Distributed estimation of deterministic signals," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 350 – 364, 2008.

[7] H. Zhu, A. Cano, and G.B. Giannakis, "Distributed consensus-based demodulation: algorithms and error analysis," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 2044–2054, June 2010.

[8] G. B. Giannakis, Q. Ling, G. Mateos, I. D. Schizas, and H. Zhu, "Proximal splitting methods in signal processing," in *Splitting Methods in Communication and Imaging*. Springer New York, 2015.

[9] A. Nedic and A. Ozdaglar, "Distributed subgradient methods for multi-agent optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 48–61, 2009.

[10] A. Nedic, A. Ozdaglar, and P.A. Parrilo, "Constrained consensus and optimization in multi-agent networks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 55, no. 4, pp. 922–938, April 2010.

[11] A. Nedic, A. Olshevsky, A. Ozdaglar, and J. N. Tsitsiklis, "Distributed subgradient methods and quantization effects," in *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Dec 2008, pp. 4177–4184.

[12] K. Srivastava and A. Nedic, "Distributed asynchronous constrained stochastic optimization," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 772–790, Aug 2011.

[13] W. Shi, Q. Ling, G. Wu, and W. Yin, "EXTRA: An exact first-order algorithm for decentralized consensus optimization," 2014, online at arXiv:1404.6264.

[14] W. Shi, Q. Ling, G. Wu, and W. Yin, "A proximal gradient algorithm for decentralized nondifferentiable optimization," in *International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, 2015.

[15] I. Chen, "Fast distributed first-order methods," 2012, Master's thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

[16] D. Jakovetic, J. Xavier, and J. M. F. Moura, "Fast distributed gradient methods," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 5, pp. 1131–1146, May 2014.

[17] J. C. Duchi, A. Agarwal, and M. J. Wainwright, "Dual averaging for distributed optimization: Convergence analysis and network scaling," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 57, no. 3, pp. 592–606, March 2012.

[18] A. Nedic and A. Olshevsky, "Distributed optimization over time-varying directed graphs," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2015, accepted.

[19] D. P. Bertsekas and J. N. Tsitsiklis, *Parallel and Distributed Computation: Numerical Methods*, Athena-Scientific, second edition, 1999.

[20] S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato, and J. Eckstein, "Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers," *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–122, 2011.

[21] R. Glowinski, *Numerical methods for nonlinear variational problems*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1984.

[22] E. Wei and A. Ozdaglar, "On the O(1/k) convergence of asynchronous distributed alternating direction method of multipliers," 2013, Preprint, available at arXiv:1307.8254.

[23] W. Shi, Q. Ling, K. Yuan, G. Wu, and W. Yin, "On the linear convergence of the ADMM in decentralized consensus optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 62, pp. 1750–1761, 2014.

[24] J. F. C. Mota, J. M. F. Xavier, P. M. Q. Aguiar, and M. Puschel, "D-admm: A communication-efficient distributed algorithm for separable optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 61, no. 10, pp. 2718–2723, May 2013.

[25] T. Erseghe, D. Zennaro, E. Dall'Anese, and L. Vangelista, "Fast consensus by the alternating direction multipliers method," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 59, no. 11, pp. 5523–5537, Nov 2011.

[26] T.-H. Chang, M. Hong, and X. Wang, "Multi-agent distributed optimization via inexact consensus admm," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 482–497, Jan 2015.

[27] Q. Ling, W. Shi, G. Wu, and A. Ribeiro, "DLM: Decentralized linearized alternating direction method of multipliers," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 63, no. 15, pp. 4051–4064, Aug 2015.

[28] M. Hong, Z.-Q. Luo, and M. Razaviyayn, "Convergence analysis of alternating direction method of multipliers for a family of nonconvex problems," 2014, submitted for publication.

[29] S. Sundlhar Ram, A. Nedić, and V. V. Veeravalli, "Distributed stochastic subgradeint projection algorithms for convex optimization," *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, vol. 147, pp. 516–545, 2010.

[30] T.-H. Chang, "A proximal dual consensus admm method for multi-agent constrained optimization," 2014, Preprint, available at arXiv:1409.3307.

[31] A. Nedic and A. Ozdaglar, "Cooperative distributed multi-agent optimization," in *Convex Optimization in Signal Processing and Communications*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.

[32] Y. Ouyang, Y. Chen, G. Lan, and Jr. E. Pasiliao, "An accelerated linearized alternating direction method of multipliers," *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 644–681, 2015.

[33] G. Mateos, J. A. Bazerque, and G. B. Giannakis, "Distributed sparse linear regression," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 58, no. 10, pp. 5262–5276, 2010.

[34] X. Gao, B. Jiang, and S. Zhang, "On the information-adaptive variants of the admm: An iteration complexity perspective," 2014, Preprint.

[35] Y. Nesterov, *Introductory lectures on convex optimization: A basic course*, Springer, 2004.

[36] H. Robbins and D. Siegmund, *A Convergence Theorem for Non-Negative Almost Supermartingales and Some Applications*, Optimizing Methods in Statistics. Academic Press, New York, 1971.